

THE  
CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER.

APRIL, 1842.

---

*Notes of a Traveller, on the Social and Political State of France, Prussia, Switzerland, Italy, and other Parts of Europe, during the present Century. By SAMUEL LAING, Esq., Author of "A Journal of a Residence in Norway," and of "A Tour in Sweden."*  
London: Longman & Co. 1842. Pp. xii. 496.

No doubt of it, Mr. Samuel Laing is a very clever person; shrewd, searching, intelligent, independent of everything like prejudice, as people call it, save a little leaning to the "land of cakes," its presbyterianism, its "Establishment,"—the late ministry,—and "civil and religious liberty all over the world." Of his class this gentleman is a very favourable specimen; he connects principles with results; he sees that there is such a thing as the dependence of the moral and social condition of a people upon abstract truths of religion: he may be, indeed he is, almost invariably wrong in his estimate of these principles, as ideas, or eternal truths; consequently, he is also wrong in his practical conclusions; but his logic is good enough; and if we add to this, that he is competently skilled in metaphysics (Scotch), that he is deep in the corn-law question, quite at home in the German commercial league, well up with the "*management*" of the poor, a desperate Drawcansir in all sorts of political economy, prædial economy, social economy, domestic economy, the economy of "functionalism and centralization," of "reproductive and un-reproductive expenditure," the economy of the olive tree, of maize, and potatoes, and the "coarser kinds of food;" never at a loss with Dr. Chalmers, Mr. Birkbeck, and Miss H. Martineau, on the suppression of mendicity, and "prudential restraints,"—a "good hater" of the fine arts, especially Raffaele and M. Angelo, (p. 13,) and a great deifier of their natural enemies, the useful ones, especially in the form of "a foundry and cotton mill," (p. 13.)—a sneerer at the old-world notions of primogeniture, and the "interests of kingdoms, territorially or dynastically considered as family estates," (p. 27,)—profound in statistics, tariffs, monopolies, gluts, over-production, and over-population, the rights of conscience, and the "spirit of Protestantism;" very

touching and very eloquent on bright visions of the future, and human perfectibility,—on the succession of “new ideas and new principles in every change,” conducing “to an evident amelioration of the moral and physical condition of mankind.” (p. 408.)—sneering, as of course he should do, at “the bigots in legislation and religious forms, and their inconsistent and fruitless attempts to hold back this mighty movement,” (p. 408.)—with a reasonable sprinkling of capital, wages, labour, beneficial investments, rent, barter, liberal views, young France, young Germany, and free-trade,—where, we ask, would you wish for a more accomplished traveller? A better representative of “the age we live in,” the said age could not produce; he is a perfect microcosm; the spirit of utilitarianism—the commercial spirit—the useful knowledge and mechanics-institute spirit—that liberalism which is liberal in every thing save charity, alms-deeds, self-denial, and love,—that religious freedom which is free from reverence, submission, faith, the sacramental sense, and the blessedness of ancient truth,—that moral sense which accommodates duty alike and doctrine, truth as well as motives, to expediency and the changeful “tendencies of the times,” or “the industrial relations” of this or of that people; he is each and all of these. Oh, age of reform! oh, epoch of universal amelioration! oh, science of social economy! oh, fixed duties! oh, preventive check! oh, Birmingham and Merthyr Tydvil, cotton and steam! these are your comforting and most hopeful results; and is not Mr. Samuel Laing your promising disciple,—nay, your epitome,—the *Edinburgh Review* in bodily form and substance,—a concrete *Wealth of Nations*,—Exeter Hall and the first reformed parliament individualized, walking, acting, travelling, publishing?

But, seriously, we have much greater fault to find with the times than with Mr. Laing. And when we find fault with the age, let us remember that “the times” is but the people, and ourselves among them; and let us humbly fear, lest while we condemn others we sentence ourselves; as, more or less we must do. Having premised this, we say that there are many things which we like in Mr. Laing. We believe that he is earnest; we are sure that he is consistent; he has no notion of submission of any sort, either of intellect, or rank, or birth, or religion; but still there is a principle in this, it may be a very false one, but he has the sense and honesty to pursue it; and deals most triumphantly with Dr. Chalmers, for instance, who “thinks the Church a useful thing for supplying younger brothers with a thousand a year.” (P. 38.) He tells that learned lecturer in the theological hall of the University of Edinburgh, that this theory of establishmentism, which places “the law, the church, colleges, and other well-appointed institutions, kept up for the good and interest of the nation,” upon the same standing, has neither “principle nor justice in it.” Then, again, he sees pretty plainly that the once-famous educational system of Prussia, which our school-mongers were raving about a few years ago, is the greatest caricature of the culti-

vation of moral and religious sentiment and independence of mind, which ever insulted a people. We extract an instructive passage.

"If education, that is, reading, writing, and arithmetic, cannot be brought within the acquirements of the common man's children, but upon the Prussian semi-coercive principle of the state, through its functionaries, intruding upon the parental duties of each individual, stepping in between the father and his family, and enforcing by state regulations, fines, and even imprisonment,\* what should be left to the moral sense of duty and natural affection of every parent who is not in a state of pupillage from mental imbecility—then is such education not worth the demoralizing price paid for it—the interference with men as free moral agents, the substitution of government enactments and superintendence in the most sacred domestic affairs for self-guidance by conscience, good principle, and common sense—the reduction, in short, of the population of a country to the social condition of a soldiery off duty roaming about their parade ground, under the eye and at the call of their superiors, without free agency or a sense of moral responsibility. Moral effects in society can only be produced by moral influences. We may drill boys into reading and writing machines; but this is not education. The almost mechanical operations of reading, writing, and reckoning, are unquestionably most valuable acquirements—who can deny, or doubt it?—but they are not education; they are the means only, not the end—the tools, not the work, in the education of man. We are too ready in Britain to consider them as tools which will work of themselves—that if the labouring man is taught to read his Bible, he becomes necessarily a moral, religious man—that to read is to think. This confounding of the means with the end is practically a great error. We see no such effects from the acquisition of much higher branches of school education, and by those far above the social position of the labouring man. Reading and writing are acquirements very widely diffused in Paris, in Italy, in Austria, in Prussia, in Sweden; but the people are not moral, nor religious, nor enlightened, nor free, because they possess the means; they are not of educated mind in any true sense. If the ultimate object of all education and knowledge be to raise man to the feeling of his own moral worth, to a sense of his responsibility to his Creator and to his conscience for every act, to the dignity of a reflecting, self-guiding, virtuous, religious member of society, then the Prussian educational system is a failure. It is only a training from childhood in the conventional discipline and submission of mind which the state exacts from its subjects. It is not a training or education which has raised, but which has lowered, the human character. This system of interference and intrusion into the inmost domestic relations of the people, this educational drill of every family by state means and machinery, supersedes parental tuition. It is a fact not to be denied, that the Prussian population is at this day, when the fruits of this educational system may be appreciated in the generation of the adults, in a remarkably demoralized condition in those branches of moral conduct which cannot be taught in schools, and are not taught by the parents, because parental tuition is broken in upon by governmental interference in Prussia, its efficacy and weight annulled, and the natural dependence of the child upon the words and wisdom of its parent—the delicate threads by which the infant's mind, as its

\* I asked an intelligent Prussian what could be done if a parent refused to send his child to school? He told me he had lately been at the police-office when a man was brought in for not sending his girl to school. She could not read, although advancing to the age to be confirmed. The man said his girl was earning her bread at a manufactory which he named, and he could not maintain her at school. He was asked why he did not send her to the evening schools established for such cases, and held after working hours, or to the Sunday schools? He said his wife had a large family of young infants, and his girl had to keep them when she came from her work, while her mother was washing for them, and doing other needful family work, which she could not do with a child in her arms. The man was told that he would be committed to prison if he and his wife did not send their girl to school.

body, draws nutriment from its parent—is ruptured. They know little of human nature who know not that more of moral education may be conveyed in a glance of a mother's eye than in a whole course of reading and writing, under educational sergeants in primary schools and gymnasia. Of all the virtues, that which the domestic family education of both the sexes most obviously influences—that which marks more clearly than any other the moral condition of a society, the home state of moral and religious principles, the efficiency of those principles in it, and the amount of that moral restraint upon passions and impulses, which it is the object of education and knowledge to attain—is undoubtedly female chastity. Will any traveller, will any Prussian say, that this index-virtue of the moral condition of a people is not lower in Prussia than in almost any part of Europe?"\*—Pp. 165-7.

In a word, he sees pretty plainly that it is not quite consistent to be always prating about free-trade in creeds, non-interference in religion, and such like, and then to advocate compulsory education; dragooning little boys to schools and gymnasia, progymnasia, normal schools, seminaries, real schools, primary and secondary colleges, and the rest of the barrack-master drill of most things in Prussia.

Mr. Laing says the same of the construction of the present Prussian state establishment of religion, "that third thing—the new Prussian Church, neither Lutheran nor Calvinist,—which was set up and imposed by the edict of civil power, upon the Protestant population." (P. 176.) He cannot quite see how this is to be reconciled with the spirit of Protestantism; and as long as he chooses to consider Protestantism the uncontrolled exercise of individual judgment, we partake in his amazement. We can quite understand him characterising this as "a measure not only destructive to the Protestant religion, but the most arbitrary and insulting to freedom of mind and conscience, that has occurred in modern history." (Ibid.) He asks, with some force,

"Who would suppose at the very period Victor Cousin, the Edinburgh Reviewers, and so many other eminent literary men of all countries were extolling the national education and general acquirement of reading in Prussia, this educating government was driving, by religious persecution, from her educated land, upwards of 600 Christians, who went from Silesia to the wilds of America, simply to enjoy the privileges of religious freedom, and of communicating at the altar according to the forms and doctrines of Luther and Calvin, rather than of his late majesty?"—P. 232. "History will have her day of judgment; she will hear the cry of the victims, said to have been 2,966 individuals, suffering for their religious or political opinions, imprisonment, civil disabilities, or other punishments, for this Prussian crime of worshipping God in their own houses, and who were only liberated by the act of amnesty, August 1840, on the death of the late sovereign."—Pp. 219, 232.

"The parish of Hermannsdorf, under its minister the pastor Berger, and the parish of Hoenigern, consisting of ten villages, under its pastor Kellner, refused obedience to the order of the consistory to introduce the new service, and continued to use the old liturgy and service, and to receive the sacrament according to the old Lutheran formulary—it is the body and blood of Christ. The

\* In 1837 the number of females in the Prussian population between the beginning of their sixteenth year and the end of their forty-fifth year—that is, within child-bearing age—was 2,983,146; the number of illegitimate children born in the same year was 39,501, so that 1 in every 75 of the whole of the females of an age to bear children, had been the mother of an illegitimate child.



people flocked from far and near to these genuine old Lutheran preachers. The consistory of Breslau ordered pastor Berger to administer the sacrament alternately according to the new and the old service. He refused any such compromise of conscience, any such *juste milieu* in his religious persuasion and duty, and was consequently suspended. In the great parish of Hoenigern, pastor Kellner adopted measures for a more powerful opposition. Before the arrival of the commissioners of the consistory, he surrendered the church keys and church property into the hands of forty elders chosen from the congregation, who received the commission, with their minister at their head, singing psalms, and who gave a decided No to the question, if they would receive the new liturgy and agenda. The commissioners were not admitted into the church; and when they pronounced a sentence of suspension against Kellner, he protested against their authority as not representing the true Lutheran church by law established in the land. Kellner and his elders were arrested and imprisoned at Breslau; but when the minister appointed as his successor came to perform the church service according to the new agenda, he found the church doors nailed, and a crowd of people obstructing the entrance. On the 20th December, 1834, a body of 400 infantry, 50 hussars, and 50 cuirassiers, marched from Breslau to this recusant parish of Hoenigern. The civil and clerical authorities again tried in vain to induce the people to accept the new service. Their elders and pastor had been twelve weeks in prison, but they continued obstinate; and, at last, on Christmas eve, the military took possession of the church, forced open the door by a petard, and dispersed the people by a charge of cavalry, in which some twenty persons were wounded. The interim minister was thus intruded into the church, and the new service was performed on Christmas day, but it was to a congregation of soldiers only; for not one parishioner was to be seen in the church. It was necessary to resort to other measures to obtain a real congregation for the new service and the stormed parish church. The military were stationed in the villages of the parish, and each recusant householder was punished by having ten or twelve soldiers quartered on him. The soldiers themselves were to exhort their landlords to go to the church, that they might be relieved from the ruinous quartering of men upon them, and those who would not conform were exposed to gross ill usage. These are the peasants, who, ruined by this persecution, sought a refuge in America."—Pp. 224, 225.

At these results of centralization and national education, Mr. Laing marvels much; so do we; but more of this anon. We prefer at present to advert to a kindred topic. Mr. Laing is a pure voluntarist; he thinks that in politics, religion, education, trade, we have but to create the sense of want, and the want will remedy itself; in other words, make a man feel that he is a rascal, and he and his brethren of Field-lane, will procure a new statute against petty larceny. Leave a nation's religious opinions alone; leave their education alone; the greatest curse to a people is for the "finger of government interfering in all action and opinion, and leaving nothing to free will and uncontrolled individual judgment." This theory he applies, as in other instances, so in a passage not more remarkable for the extraordinary facts which it details, than favourably characteristic of our author's power and style.

"I happened to be at Geneva one Sunday morning as the bells were tolling to church. The very sounds which once called the powerful minds of a Calvin, a Knox, a Zwingli, to religious exercise and meditation, were now summoning the descendants of their contemporaries to the same house of prayer. There are few Scotchmen whose hearts would not respond to such a call. I hastened to the ancient cathedral, the church of St. Peter, to see the pulpit from which

Calvin had preached, to sit possibly in the very seat from which John Knox has listened, to hear the pure doctrines of Christianity from the preachers who now stand where once the great champions of the Reformation stood; to mark, too, the order and observances of the Calvinistic service here in its native church; to revive, too, in my mind, Scotland, and the picturesque Sabbath days of Scotland in a foreign land. But where is the stream of citizens' families in the streets, so remarkable a feature in every Scotch town when the bells are tolling to church, family after family, all so decent and respectable in their Sunday clothes, the fathers and mothers leading the younger children, and all walking silently churchwards? and where the quiet, the repose, the stillness of the Sabbath morning, so remarkable in every Scotch town and house? Geneva, the seat and centre of Calvinism, the fountain-head from which the pure and living waters of our Scottish Zion flow, the earthly source, the pattern, the Rome of our Presbyterian doctrine and practice, has fallen lower from her own original doctrine and practice than ever Rome fell. Rome has still superstition; Geneva has not even that semblance of religion. In the head church of the original seat of Calvinism, in a city of five-and-twenty thousand souls, at the only service on the Sabbath day—*there being no evening service*—I sat down in a congregation of about two hundred females, and three-and-twenty males, mostly elderly men of a former generation, with scarcely a youth, or boy, or working man among them. A meagre liturgy, or printed form of prayer, a sermon, which, as far as religion was concerned, might have figured the evening before at a meeting of some geological society, as an "ingenious essay" on the Mosaic chronology, a couple of psalm tunes on the organ, and a waltz to go out with, were the church service. In the afternoon, the only service in towns or in the country is reading a chapter of the Bible to the children, and hearing them gabble over the Catechism in a way which shows they have not a glimpse of the meaning. A pleasure tour in the steam-boats, which are regularly advertised for a Sunday promenade round the lake, a pic-nic dinner in the country, and overflowing congregations in the evening at the theatre, the equestrian circus, the concert saloons, ball rooms, and coffee houses, are all that distinguish Sunday from Monday in that city in which, three centuries before, Calvin moved the senate and the people to commit to the flames his own early friend Servetus, the discoverer of the circulation of the blood, (?) and one of the first philosophers of that age, for presuming to differ in opinion and strength of argument from his own religious dogma. This is action and reaction in religious spirit with a vengeance. In the village churches, along the Protestant side of the Lake of Geneva—spots upon this earth specially intended, the traveller would say, to elevate the mind of man to his Creator by the glories of the surrounding scenery—the rattling of the billiard balls, the rumbling of the skittle trough, the shout, the laugh, the distant shots of the rifle gun clubs, are heard above the psalm, the sermon, and the barren forms of state-prescribed prayer, during the one brief service on Sundays, delivered to very scanty congregations, in fact, to a few females and a dozen or two old men, in very populous parishes supplied with able and zealous ministers.

"What may be the causes of this remarkable difference in the working of Calvinism in Switzerland and Scotland? The churches of Geneva and Scotland set out together on their Christian pilgrimage, in the days of Calvin and Knox, with the same profession of faith, the same doctrines, and the same forms in congregational worship. We, the vulgar of the kirk of Scotland, have at least always been taught to consider the church of Geneva as the mother-church of our Presbyterian faith, and established church usages—the model by which both our doctrines and practices were framed and adjusted into their present shape. How widely the two have wandered from each other! The member of the Scotch kirk comes out of the church of Geneva inquiring if it be a Calvinistic or Lutheran service he has been attending—the liturgy, or printed prescribed form of prayer, is there, the organ is there, and the sermon is a neat little moral essay that might do for either, or for any congregation. Scotland is at this day the most religious Protestant country in Europe; and in no country

in Europe, Protestant or Catholic, is the church attendance worse, the regard for the ordinary observances of religious worship less, the religious indifference—not entitled to be called infidelity, not so respectable as infidelity, because not arising from any reasoning or thinking, wrong or right, about religion—greater than in Protestant Switzerland, in the district of our Calvinistic mother-church in and about Geneva. Whence is this remarkable difference? The starting point of the human mind was the same in both countries, at the same period, and under the same leaders, Calvin and Knox; and the present divergence of the human mind in its religious direction in Switzerland and Scotland is as striking as was the original coincidence.

"The only obvious cause of this divergence is, that the state and church in Switzerland have from the first engrafted on Calvinism a bastard Lutheranism. It is characteristic of Calvinism as received in Scotland, that it is the only branch of Christianity which flourishes independently of all church establishments, state assistance, or government arrangements, and requires no union of church and state. Spiritual, and unconnected with forms, it is injured by government interference and regulation. In Scotland itself religion is more flourishing in the Secession than in the Established Church, simply because the former is a voluntary, the latter a state church. The doctrine and church observances and education of the ministers are the same in both. The state has—and Calvin himself in conjunction with the state, to prevent probably the excitement of the public mind by the extemporary prayers of fanatic preachers adapting their effusions to the passing feelings of their congregations, or to keep them exclusively Calvinists, and out of the hearing, as far as possible, of other impressions—prescribed a set form of printed prayer, a liturgy, in settling the church discipline and usages of the church of Geneva. The Scotch Calvinistic church, about sixty years after the Reformation, repudiated such interference, even from the church power, with individual freedom of thought and expression in prayer, as being contrary to the genuine spirit of Calvinism. The Scotch were more Calvinistic than Calvin himself. Time has proved that the Scotch kirk was right. In Switzerland, in attempting to guard the people by prescribed forms, against the diseases of fanaticism and erroneous doctrine, the state and Calvinistic church have inoculated the people with the worse disease of indifference."—Pp. 324—328.

Scotch Calvinism, or rather Calvinism-out-Calvinized, then, we are to understand, has not degenerated into heathenism—for we cannot find a milder word—which is the case with Genevan Calvinism, because it has not been polluted by set forms issued by the state; though, to do Mr. Laing justice, he does not say that forms of prayer, as such, have this invariable tendency. He speaks of "the venerated antiquity, the admirable eloquence, and the application to every condition and every mind, of the fine ancient liturgy of the English Church." He says, and says with truth, that "the liturgy in the English Church is the most important part of the pastoral duty," the preaching is but secondary and subsidiary;" but in the Scotch Calvinistic church "the substance of the service is in the sermon." He only says that liturgies and Calvinism are incompatible,—hence the fall or the eradication of all religion in Geneva; to which he bears such melancholy testimony, by the attempt to combine irreconcilable elements. Nor are we prepared to say that there is not *some* truth in this: the Scotch religionism is consistent,—it holds well together,—right or wrong, it is intelligible; there is no egregious illogical process in it: Genevan Calvinism, as described above, is a Mezentian monster; and men's minds soon find out these incongruities; one principle or the other

they are not slow to perceive must be utterly false; and when truth and falsehood are mixed in the same cup, what wonder if men reject the unnatural compound! Error itself may pass muster when there is nothing with which to contrast it; but if you wish to pass off a bad shilling do not tender a good one with it, for the chances are, that even if you find a clown who does not know which is the counterfeit, he will be sharp enough to throw them both in your face. But is it wholly so? are there no other causes than this to account for a difference which none can deny? Is the proximity to England, and intercourse with her sounder creed to go for nothing? among the counteracting influences in the sister kingdom, may we not enumerate the state protection, the manses, and parishes, and endowments, which Mr. Laing passes over, *sub silentio*, or rather, if he were consistent, ought to place to the opposite account? and above all, is not the origin of the two connexions essentially different? Calvin was a layman. He and the magistrates of Geneva invented a form of church-government out of their own heads; they pretended no divine appointment; they laid no claim to apostolic descent. Knox and his coadjutors were at least presbyters. We know not how far God has overruled to good what seemed to them but an unimportant accident in the formation of their kirk; but surely presbyterian succession is better than the self-appointed ordinances of mere schismatical laymen; the single grain of the "salt of the earth" alloyed, counteracted, debased though it has been by other elements of evil, may have preserved Scotland from that utter corruption which has banished God's presence from Geneva. If Mr. Cumming and kindred writers are to be relied upon as fair exponents of presbyterianism, they do as a fact prefer authoritative claims to apostolic succession; it is because presbyterianism was the primitive discipline, because the Scotch pastors are the rightful successors, as they tell us, of the Apostles, that they "sit in Moses' seat." Whether the fact be so or not, at least the appeal must go for something; the great Head of the Church may have regarded with favour the attempt, however erroneous and false, to secure incorporation with Him, by means of the Church, which is His body, in preference to the deliberate and wilful slighting of His ordinance, never controverted for 1500 years, which has ruined the self-derived Calvinism of Geneva.

Mr. Laing bears impartial—indeed, in his case, it must be unwilling, and therefore most noticeable—testimony, as do all well-informed writers, to the extraordinary re-action in favour of Catholicism on the continent. Indeed he calls attention to the revival of the Church of Rome, in terms quite as startling to Protestant ears, as Ranke's historical facts.

"Catholicism has certainly a much stronger hold over the human mind than Protestantism. The fact is visible and undeniable, and perhaps not unaccountable. The fervour of devotion among these Catholics, the absence of all worldly feelings in their religious acts, strike every traveller who enters a Roman Catholic church abroad. They seem to have no reserve, no false shame, false pride, or whatever the feeling may be, which, among us Protestants, makes the

individual exercise of devotion, private, hidden—an affair of the closet. Here, and everywhere in Catholic countries, you see well-dressed people, persons of the higher as well as of the lower orders, on their knees upon the pavement of the church, totally regardless of and unregarded by the crowd of passengers in the aisles moving to and fro. I have christian charity enough to believe, and I do not envy that man's mind who does not believe, that this is quite sincere devotion, and not hypocrisy, affectation, or attempt at display. It is so common, that none of these motives could derive the slightest gratification from the act—not more than a man's vanity could be gratified by his appearing in shoes, or a hat, where all wear the same. In no Protestant place of worship do we witness the same intense abstraction in prayer, the same unaffected devotion of mind. The beggar woman comes in here and kneels down by the side of the princess, and evidently no feeling of intrusion suggests itself in the mind of either. To the praise of the papists be it said, no worldly distinctions, or human rights of property, much less money-payment for places in a place of worship, appear to enter into their imaginations. Their churches are God's houses, open alike to all his rational creatures, without distinction of high or low, rich or poor. All who have a soul to be saved come freely to worship. They have no family pews, *no seats for gentle souls, and seats for vulgar souls. Their houses of worship are not let out, like theatres, or opera houses, or Edinburgh kirks, for money rents for the sittings.* The public mind is evidently more religionized than in Protestant countries. Why should such strong devotional feeling be more widely diffused and more conspicuous among people holding erroneous doctrines, than among us Protestants holding right doctrines? This question can only be solved by comparing the machinery of each church."—Pp. 430, 431.

And then he goes on to say, that although Protestant doctrine be right, its Church machinery is not so effective as that of the Catholics. The popish priest is, in profession, more of a sacred character; more cut off from worldly affairs than the Protestant clergyman. Knowledge has increased in the flock. The Scotch pastors have not made proportionate advances; they have not kept themselves ahead of the people. Since they cannot challenge a peculiar sanctity for their order,—since there is no sacramental function to constitute them a peculiar class in the eyes and feelings of mankind, by virtue of their ordination,—since the Reformation exploded the papistical pretensions of an order of priesthood,—since "scriptural knowledge, piety, sanctity, and all religious gifts, powers, advantages, and abilities, stand equally open to all men, to be attained through faith and their Bibles,"—(p. 434)—"it is an hopeless claim now, in an educated age, for members of a profession not better educated than men of other professions, not separated by any peculiar exclusive religious function from the ordinary business, interests, modes of living of other well-conducted men, to obtain a separate station in society, analogous to that of the popish clergy."—P. 433.

Persecution has improved the popish clergy.

"The effects of the Revolution have been to reverse the position of the clergy of the two churches; and to place the Catholic, now on the vantage ground in the eye of the vulgar of the continental populations, of being poor and sincere, while the Protestant clergy are, at least, comfortable, and well paid for their sincerity. The sleek, fat, narrow-minded, wealthy drone, is now to be sought for on the episcopal bench, or in the prebendal stall of the Lutheran (?) or Anglican churches; the well-off, comfortable parish minister, yeomanlike in mind, intelligence, and social position, in the manse and glebe of the Calvinistic

church. The poverty-stricken, intellectual recluse, never seen abroad, but on his way to or from his studies or church duties, living nobody knows how; but all know in the poorest manner, upon a wretched pittance in his obscure abode—and this is the popish priest of the 19th century—has all the advantage of position with the multitude for giving effect to his teaching.”—P. 435.

We have a very erroneous impression of the state of the popish clergy. It is untrue, “injudicious as well as uncharitable,” to speak of their luxury and ignorance. In zeal, liberal views, and genuine piety, they are equal to the Scotch clergy; in education “positively higher, and without doubt, comparatively higher.”—P. 436. We should “understand better the strength of a formidable adversary, who is evidently gaining ground but too fast upon our Protestant Church,” by the “vantage ground of superior education and learning, and consequently of moral influence as teachers.”—P. 437.

“It is unfortunate, also, for the influence of the Scotch Calvinistic church, that its service consists exclusively of extemporary effusions or temporary compositions. These, composed in haste by men of moderate education, and often of small abilities, have to undergo the comparison, in the mind of an educated and reading congregation, with similar compositions, prayers, or sermons prepared carefully for the press, by the most able and learned divines. The moral influence resting solely on such a church service cannot be permanent. As a machinery, the English Church is founded on a more lasting and influential basis; its established forms of prayer, unobjectionably good in themselves, not placing one minister or his compositions in competition with another, or with other similar compositions, in the public mind—the almost mechanical operation of reading the service well or ill, being all the comparison that can be made between two clergymen in the essential part of the church duty. The competition, also, or comparison of any other compositions of the same kind, however excellent, with the old liturgy, can never occur in the public mind in England; because the liturgy has use and wont, antiquity, repetition from childhood to old age, in its favour, and is interwoven with the habits of the people by these threads, in all their religious exercises.”—P. 438.

The comparative education of the Scotch clergy, compared to that of the Scotch people, is unquestionably lower than that of the popish clergy, compared to the education of their people. The Catholic clergy have nothing to lose by the spread of education, because they have the sacerdotal character to fall back upon. But they are not content with this; they make use of general education; they encourage it as a mighty instrument; they use it ably. “In Catholic Germany, in France, Italy, and even Spain, the education of the common people in reading, writing, arithmetic, music, manners and morals, is at least as generally diffused, and as faithfully promoted by the clerical body, as in Scotland.”—P. 439. In Rome there are schools in every street; with a population of 158,678, it has 372 public primary schools, with 482 teachers, and 14,099 children attending them; a university with 660 students; and seven universities in the papal states for two millions and a half of people. All this mass of education the clergy direct: “the flocks follow the more readily for being trained, if the leaders only keep ahead of the crowd.”—P. 441. The Catholic clergy have adroitly seized on education; they have made use of the great revival of religious



feeling, and the reaction consequent upon the reign of French infidelity; they have entered into the spirit of the age; they have exerted the elasticity and flexibility of their Church to "cover with the mantle of Catholicism opinions wide enough to have caused schisms and sects in former ages."—P. 444. Their religion "adapts itself to every degree of intelligence and to every class of intellect; it is a net which adapts its meshes to the minnow and the whale."—P. 445. The general doctrines of Christianity are as ably inculcated as from our own pulpits.

"I strolled one Sunday evening in Prussia into the Roman Catholic church at Bonn, on the Rhine. The priest was catechizing, examining, and instructing the children of the parish, in the same way, and upon the same plan, and with the same care to awaken the intellectual powers of each child by appropriate questions and explanations, as in our well conducted Sunday schools that are taught on the system of the Edinburgh Sessional School. And what of all subjects was the subject this Catholic priest was explaining and inculcating to Catholic children; and by his familiar questions, and their answers, bringing most admirably home to their intelligence?—the total uselessness and inefficacy of mere forms of prayer, or verbal repetitions of prayers, if not understood and accompanied by mental occupation with the subject, and the preference of silent mental prayer to all forms—and this most beautifully brought out to suit the intelligence of the children. I looked around me, to be satisfied that I was really at the altar steps of a popish church, and not in the school-room of Dr. Muir's, or any other well-taught Presbyterian parish in Edinburgh."—P. 446.

The apparent unity of belief in the Romish Church is much in its favour. This unity is only apparent, but it is very engaging.

And the adjustment of "material ideas" to assist the mental energies accounts for "the greater devotional fervour of Catholics than Protestants."—P. 448.

"*Fas est, &c.*" Let us ponder these things well. Here is a *précis* of the causes of the success of continental Catholicism, from which we may draw a deep, and if we will, a most instructive lesson. It is drawn up, and with no mean skill, by one who is a friend neither of us nor of Rome: the more valuable then his testimony. What Mr. Laing says is extorted from him; he is, with all sincerity, as little disposed to praise Rome as he must be disinclined to arraign Scotch Calvinism. We may learn equally from the failure of the one as from the advance of the other. The picture may be overcharged, as where he says, that "relic veneration, pilgrimages, penances, and processional mummeries\* appear to be silently relaxed, or relinquished;" but it is substantially true. Let us dare to look these in the face. Here is a warm friend of the principle at least of the Scotch communion, an admirer and advocate of its theory, admitting that the lack of a priestly and exclusive character of the ministry sinks its influence immeasurably below the authoritative and hierarchical claims of Rome. Are we prepared to give up this claim? Are we ready to

\* Was the author ever in Sicily? because he would have qualified this expression, had he ever witnessed the painful processions exhibited in Messina, or in Catania: for example, at the feast of the Immaculate Conception.

forego our apostolic credentials? Should we not rather "stir up the gift which is in us from putting on of hands," develop our sacred character, claim from God that grace with which the Holy Spirit, at ordination, has sanctified our ministrations, show the world openly what is the heavenly power of our commission, and what is the danger to souls in neglecting the appointed means of grace? If the strength of Rome consists in this,—if we have equal and superior titles to this power,—shall souls perish because we fail in telling men of their duties, in manfully displaying those "gifts and powers" which are not our own, but the presence of Christ dwelling in His Church, and in that alone?

Or again, we may bear the taunt, "the Puseyites of the Church of England alone are inconsequent; for if they claim apostolic succession and apostolic reverence for the clerical body, they should lead the apostolic life of celibacy, and repudiate their worldly spouses, interests, and objects."—P. 432. We may bear the taunt, because we can deny the fact, that the celibate of the clergy is an apostolic ordinance, and therefore we escape the charge of a logical inconsequence; but we may profit by this. They that "have wives may be as though they had none:" we may, by purity of life, by self-denial, by walking among men as a holy and separate class, preach by our practice against licentiousness and avarice, evil passions, and worldliness.

If persecution and the neglect of the state has strengthened Rome, it seems as though God's good providence, by providing sharper discipline, were training us to higher duties and more vigorous efforts. No poverty can be much deeper than that to which we are hastening. The multiplication of small benefices, the infinitesimal subdivision of the revenues of the Church, will leave us all poor enough. But our "deep poverty may abound to riches," if we have but grace to be thankful for it, and to use it.

Once more, if, as an alien confesses, our power is in our Church Service, what folly were it not to multiply our prayers; what madness were it to throw away our sole strength! To prize and magnify the blessedness of the Prayer Book, to carry out all its orders, to teach its whole spirit, to exhibit in action the whole system, the heart as well as the form, of our ritual, we are assured, by those who love us not, is that upon which our superior moral influence solely rests. Why, then, should the pulpit take precedence of the altar, as it does?

Has Rome acted with serpentine prudence in cultivating education? Should not "the priest's lips keep knowledge?" Are we to despise a learned clergy, and boast that we have no time to read? Are we prepared, with these startling proofs before us, to give up the education of youth to a government board, to submit to an Irish scheme, from which religion is excluded, or, still worse, taught under a hundred forms? Should we not rather take warning from the success of our enemies, and recur to that oral and catechetical teaching, which, while it cultivates the head, allures, and softens, and engages the heart? If in Rome the clergy "hold the reins, and are the superintendents, if not

the actual teachers in all the schools," it is our policy to take a leaf out of the same book : and if it be true, as to some extent it is, that among us "the scholars have outgrown the teachers; and the teachers, instead of advancing with and leading the progress of the age, are in danger of becoming superannuated appendages on the religion of the people, sustained by it, not sustaining it, nor capable of directing it in the vast educational and missionary efforts which the religious sentiments of the people are making by their own agents,"—(p. 444)—we ought to be more than ever cautious how we plunge into the undisciplined chaos of Bible Societies, and Pastoral Aid Societies, and City Missions, and the like, in which "an evangelical laity acts independently, and too frequently in opposition to the Church," to use our author's striking phrase.

Unity, we are told, even though apparent, not real, has a power unknown to Protestantism. "There is," Mr. Laing tells us, "distinct ground for sectarianism and dissent in the very nature of the Protestant Church."—P. 447. If this be its innate tendency, if it be its essence, we must take ourselves to task; seriously, though it be painfully, examine the fact; and if we have not "touched the unclean thing," if we are not committed to this principle, it is our plain duty to deny the charge; to repudiate with scorn the attempt to fasten it upon us; and show forth our Catholic surname in the eyes of foes alike and friends. We repeat, then, that we may profit much by this painfully instructive chapter, the twenty-first, on Catholicism and Protestantism.

But the most interesting portion of Mr. Laing's book remains: we refer to the chapters vii. and viii., on the history and formation of the new Prussian church.

Into the original differences between Calvin and Luther,—how Zwingli endeavoured, at least as far as teaching went, to separate, and Melancthon to reconcile, though by his vacillations he rather disturbed, the discordant elements,—this is not the place to enter. The difficulty and absurdity of confession succeeding confession, and explanation following apology, was soon felt; and as there has always been a vast deal of electoral and imperial influence in religious matters in Germany, the first attempt to promote unity even among the daily diverging elements of the Lutheran body, was by the Formula Concordiæ of 1577, promoted by the Elector Augustus of Saxony; an agreeable appendix of eclecticism this to the Confession of Augsburg, and Melancthon's defence of it, the Articles of Smalcald, and Luther's two catechisms, all of which were required, in the sixteenth century, as credentials for the ministry. The Lutheran body, never remarkably harmonious in temper, found out in time that this array of fences was not agreeable; beyond them lay the smiling fields of Protestantism in its full development. The symbolical books, too, made a sort of theological hedge, but it was not very uniform; it was weak in some places, and needlessly formidable in others: how were they to escape? Some clever person or other found out a device,

unequalled in acuteness; they would not grub up the fence—forbid it the memory of all the Reformers! but they would put a snug little wicket gate, which should always be a-jar, and then, why, “we can get out when we like, and wander as far as we please, and the fence and ditch will look as strong and secure as ever.” And, with a vengeance, they did stray pretty far from Luther’s stout dogmatism, till rationalism and infidelity found themselves in all but undisturbed possession of nine out of ten pulpits and churches in Germany.

What do our readers fancy was this wicket gate?—Only one little clause crept in; just four words were added. Nobody knew how they came there—few stopped to inquire: the ministers swore to all the volumes of articles at which their fathers made such wry faces, and they could with equal safety have sworn to two dozen or two score such confessions; for they qualified it all by the convenient salvo, “*quatenus cum SS. concordant.*” Here was latitude enough—a comprehensive mantle, which included the amiable Stock and the infidel Paulus under the same ample folds; which could reject neither Wegscheider nor Strauss, even while it embraced Neander and Tholuck. We are not desirous of re-writing one of the most painful chapters in religious history; the late Mr. Rose has done it most ably. Indifference and absolute irreligion were the natural results of their qualification. Mosheim describes it complacently in a well-known passage:—

“The Reformed church still carries the same external aspect. For though there be everywhere extant certain books, creeds, and confessions, by which the wisdom and vigilance of ancient times thought proper to perpetuate the truths of religion, and to preserve them from the contagion of heresy, yet, in most places, no person is obliged to adhere strictly to the doctrines they contain; and those who profess the main and fundamental truths of the christian religion, and take care to avoid *too great an intimacy (nimiam consuetudinem)* with the tenets of Socinianism and Popery, are deemed worthy members of the Reformed church. Hence, in our times, this great and extensive community comprehends in its bosom Arminians, Calvinists, Super-lapsarians, Sub-lapsarians, and Universalists [a few years more would have added Infidels and Pantheists] who live together in charity and friendship, and unite their efforts in healing the breach, and diminishing the weight and importance of those controversies that separate them from each other.”—*Century xviii.*

So much for the stability of Lutheran doctrine.

But what was their discipline? Had they no liturgy, no form of prayer? Yes.

“Several were composed; not one was generally received, nor enforced by authority; and of these different forms, almost all have long fallen into disuse, from the want of a church government, which had either the ability or the will to enforce their use, and from the changes of opinion and entire indifference of the clergy themselves.”—*Rose on German Protestantism*, p. 18.

And though we hear of this or that *liturgy*, it must be borne in mind that the phrase is often applied to regulations of the form of worship,—*agenda* seems the German phrase,—and not in the subordinate sense of the office of prayers, still less in its stricter sense of the eucharistic office, to which it ought to be confined.

This was the Lutheran church (!) of the present century; we now turn to the other passive party to the marriage, so happily celebrated *auspiciis Regis Serenissimi Frederici Gulielmi, Fidei Paranympbi*.

The Calvinist body, or rather, "the Reformed church," made short work both of confessions and liturgies. They were consistent in so doing.\* The Heidelberg Catechism was most in favour, but it was not imperative; the decrees of the synod of Dort were not sufficiently stringent, nor sufficiently liked, to prevent the most fearful intestine differences; the *Formula Consensus Helvetica*, by deciding, but embroiled the fray; besides, its influence was scarcely felt on the "yesty wave" of Calvinistic liberty; and Mosheim speaks of it as "deprived of all authority, and sunk into utter oblivion." Rose thinks it doubtful whether subscription, even at first, was required: it is certain that very early in the history of this communion, the most unbounded liberty of thought and teaching was permitted, if not encouraged; indeed, the bodies composing the complex "Reformed church," rather rejected unity than desired it. If liturgies and forms of administering the sacraments are appointed, yet they are not imperative: though they are used in France, and, as we have seen, at Geneva, the unrebuked and unrebukable pleasure of the German and Scotch ministers has dispensed even with forms; and prayer is abandoned to the enthusiasm or the carelessness, the ignorance or the indecency, of individual teachers.

In France we believe the Reformed service to consist of a portion of Scripture, the Decalogue, a prayer from the Genevan liturgy, a psalm, an extempore prayer and sermon, another prayer from the service book, a hymn, the blessing.

In Germany, as has been shown, some congregations, or rather some teachers, used some liturgy or other, and some used none. And these were the elements of religion which the late king of Prussia found in his dominions; these the sons of the Reformation, celebrating the third centenary of its existence, in the year 1817.

On the Lutheran side there was high doctrine enough. There is consubstantiation, of which Mr. Laing, as was to have been expected, speaks in the most flippant and offensive way (as he does elsewhere of the real presence). "The Puseyite may perhaps understand it; the Calvinist can only wish him joy of his intellect; the doctrine borders on sheer nonsense."—P. 184. He adds that it has been lowered into practical Zwinglianism. This is not the point; it is the doctrine of the body, and as Lutherans have not rejected the Augsburg Confession, it may be as well to remind our Records and Christian

\* Mr. Laing (p. 184) has an extraordinary passage:—"The *Formula Consensus*, and the Resolutions of the synod of Dort, are the only symbolical writings of the Calvinistic church (!) which retain the doctrine of predestination in all its Calvinistic rigidity. The other German confessions of faith softened and modified it from time to time; and, at last, the Heidelberg Catechism omitted it." Does he imagine that the Form of Concord of 1675, and the Dordrecht decrees of 1619, became modified and unused and relaxed in a catechism dated 1563?

Observers, what this same document contains, "De confessione docent quod *absolutio priuata* in ecclesiis retinenda sit." "Falso accusantur nostræ ecclesiæ, quod missam aboleant, retinetur enim missa apud nos, et summâ reverentiâ celebratur." "Servatur apud nos una communis missa *singulis feriis, atque aliis etiam diebus*." "Confessio in ecclesiis apud nos non est abolita. Docentur homines ut absolutionem pluriini faciant, quia sit vox Dei, et mandato Dei pronuncietur. Ornatur potestas clavium." "Sentiunt potestatem clavium seu potestatem episcoporum, juxta evangelium potestatem esse Dei." And there are certain observations which draw a distinction between popular practices (quidam abusus) and the authorized teaching of the Roman church, as in the matter of the mass, where the *mass* itself (*missa*) is retained, while private *masses* and *missæ collatæ ad quæstum* are rejected; and in confession, and in fasting, when occasion is taken to say, "Christianus debeat se corporali disciplinâ aut corporalibus exercitiis et laboribus sic exercere et coercere, ne saturitas aut desidia extimet ad peccandum;" and in the celibate of the clergy, where the point urged is, "Status monasteriorum qualis fuerat," so many of these observations are there, that we are strongly reminded of a certain No. 90. But the fear of the Record overpowers us, and we pause. We will just dare to ask some of our friends who are loudest in their praises of the "sister churches of the continent," whether they ever saw this sentence:—"Hæc summa est doctrinæ. Et consentaneam esse judicamus et propheticæ ac apostolicæ scripturæ, et catholicæ ecclesiæ; postremo etiam Romanæ ecclesiæ, quatenus ex probatis scriptoribus nota est. Non enim aspernamur consensum catholicæ ecclesiæ, nec est animus nobis ullum novum dogma et ignotum sanctæ ecclesiæ invehere in ecclesiam. Nec patrocinari impiis aut seditiosis opinionibus volumus, quas ecclesia catholica damnavit."—*Confess. Aug. in Epilogo*. We repeat, then, as far as words go, there is catholic doctrine enough on one side of the compact.\*

But how stands the Reformed, or Calvinistic, church, for positive doctrine?

Τρις μὲν ἰφωρμήθην, ἔλκειν τέ με θυμὸς ἄνωγε,  
 Τρις δέ μοι ἐκ χειρῶν σκιῇ εἶκελον, ἥ καὶ ὄνειρψ,  
 Ἑπτατο ———

Definition fails where you must use but negatives. What little of doctrine Calvinism ever possessed had been evaporated; the

\* We are aware that this is only one side of the Augsburg Confession: there are very many painful things in it. For example, in the preface, "in hæc religionis causâ nostrorum concionatorum confessionem offerimus." Art. I. "Ecclesiæ apud nos docent." Art. IV. "—docent, quod homines gratis justificentur—*cum credunt se in gratiam recipi*." Art. VII. "Ad veram unitatem, satis est consentire de doctrinâ evangelii et administratione sacramentorum." Art. X. The significant change of "corpus et sanguis Christi *vere adsint*," of the first edition, to "*vere exhibeantur*," of the second. Art. XIV. The vagueness of the "rite vocatus," the sole qualification of the minister, unexplained by any ordinal or prayer-book, which settles the sense of our 23d Article. Art. VII. Of the supplement, "liceat episcopis, seu pastoribus facere ordinationes, ut res ordine gerantur," &c.



dogma of predestination was no longer rigidly taught; the teaching of Calvin, and even of Zwingli, was forgotten on the great sacramental controversy. The Reformed church was emphatically the "barren and dry land, where no water was." What possible element had it in common with Lutheranism? In theory none—in fact it had a most fatal resemblance. There was the same blight of indifference upon both communions: the Lutherans had fallen from the Confession of Augsburg by the natural steps—enthusiasm, fanaticism, divisions, indifference; 132 liturgies, church services, or agenda, in the first thirty-two years of the Reformation (we quote Mr. Laing, p. 200), were portentous elements from which to expect stability; and during his life-time, like Wesley, even the great Reformer of Geneva began to fear that he had gone too far. (What a bitter moment must that be, when a Reformer finds that he cannot control his own disciples!) The nineteenth century found the different communions of the Reformed at peace; the peace of sleep, almost of death.

The king of Prussia is but a "king of shreds and patches;" his present kingdom is made up of waifs and strays. Good luck and good management have done much for his house; a little by conquering, and a little by stealing, and a little by marriage, and a little by bargains; and thus the margravate of Brandenburg has been huckstered into the kingdom of Prussia in a hundred years or so; the very counterpart of a chandler's fortune. His people were of the same motley character.

"The Prussian population, in 1837, consisted, according to the official report of Von Hoffman, director of the statistical bureau, of 14,098,125 souls, of whom—

8,604,748	were of the United Evangelical, or new Prussian Church.
5,294,003	were of the Roman Catholic Church.
1,300	were of the Greek Church.
14,495	were Mennonites or Moravians.*
183,579	were Jews, of whom 102,917 had civil rights as Prussian subjects.

14,098,125

"Of the eight and a half millions of the former Protestant, now Evangelical Prussian church, the proportions of those who were Lutheran and Calvinistic are not known, as, after the amalgamation of the two, in 1817, into one church by royal edict, the distinction was considered as abolished in all official acts.

"It appears from the proclamation of his late Majesty, of September 27, 1817, addressed to these eight and a half millions of his Protestant subjects, that the amalgamation of the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches into one Prussian church had been a favourite idea of the royal family for some generations. The political object, probably, was to raise Prussia to the same position with regard to Protestant Germany, in which Austria stands with regard to Catholic Germany—to make the Prussian house the civil head and protector of Protestantism. This proclamation or announcement of the royal will to unite the two branches of the Protestant church into one, is of date September 27, 1817, and in words as follows:—'My illustrious ancestors, the Elector John Sigismund, the Elector George William, the great Elector and King Frederic I.,

\* Surely Mr. L. does not confound the Mennonites, who are Anabaptists, with the Moravians?

and King Frederic William II., laboured with anxious and pious care, as the history of their lives and government shows, to unite the two divided Protestant churches, the Lutheran and the Reformed (Calvinistic), into one evangelical christian church in their land. Honouring their memory and salutary intentions, I willingly join in this purpose, and pray that a work pleasing to God, which, in their days, met with insurmountable obstacles from an unhappy sectarian spirit, may, under the influence of a better spirit, which sets aside the non-essential, and holds fast by the essential in Christianity, in which both confessions of faith agree, be accomplished in my states, to the honour of God and the welfare of the christian church, at the approaching centenary commemoration of the Reformation. Such a truly religious union of the two Protestant churches, separated as they are only by external differences, accords with the great end of Christianity, fulfils the first intentions of the Reformers, is in the spirit of Protestantism, promotes the public worship, is advantageous to domestic piety, and will be the spring of many useful improvements in schools and churches, which are now prevented by differences of faith. To this wholesome, long wished-for, and often vainly attempted union, in which the Reformed (Calvinistic) church will not have to go over to the Lutheran, nor the Lutheran to the Reformed, but both will form one new created, evangelical christian church, in the spirit of their holy Founder, no obstacle now exists in the nature of things, provided both these parties earnestly, and in true christian spirit, desire it; and on the approaching occasion of returning thanks to Divine Providence for the unspeakable blessing of the Reformation, show that they truly honour the memory of its great founder, by carrying on his immortal work. But much as I wish that the Reformed and Lutheran churches in my dominions may partake with me in these well-considered views, I respect their rights and liberty, and am far from pressing them, on this occasion, to adopt and establish it. This union can only be of real value if neither persuasion nor indifference induce its acceptance, but a real and free conviction; and if its roots and existence be not planted in the inward heart, and not merely in outward forms. As I myself intend in this spirit to commemorate the centenary fast day in celebration of the Reformation, in a union of the two congregations (hitherto called the Reformed and the Lutheran congregations of the garrison and court attendants at Potsdam) into one evangelical christian congregation, and to partake with it of the holy sacrament of the Lord's supper, so I trust this my own example will operate beneficially on all the Protestant congregations in my dominions, and will be generally followed in spirit and in truth. I leave it to the wisdom of the consistories, and the pious zeal of the clergy and their synods, to determine the outward concurring forms of this union, convinced that the congregations will, in true christian spirit, willingly follow them, and that wheresoever the view is directed to what is the essential, and to the great holy subject itself, the forms will be easily adjusted, and the externals will of themselves proceed from the internals, simple, dignified, and true. May the promised period arrive, when all shall form one flock under one shepherd, with one spirit, one love, one hope!"—Pp. 177—180.

And so the church was made in the Downing-street of Berlin: and in 1822 it was fitted with a liturgy, under the auspices of Bishops\*

---

\* Among other odd functions, that of making a sort of bishop seems to have belonged to the Prussian sovereigns from the first. "Frederick, the first king of Prussia, found it necessary, for the greater solemnity of his coronation, (!) 1700-1, to give the title of bishops to two of the chief of his clergy, the one a Lutheran, the other a Reformed; the former died soon after; the other, Dr. Ursinus, continued without a colleague," &c.—*Abp. Sharp's Life*, vol. i. 403. "These bishops possess merely the name."—*Rose*. We believe that Strauss—not the notorious rationalist,—and this same Neander—not the Church historian,—at present hold this office. Some of the episcopal functions, such as confirmation, are performed by the ordinary ministers putting on a gold chain, and acting bishop, so to say, for the occasion.

Eylert and Neander; and as we have lately been told "from authority," that the "Prussian church has a national liturgy compiled from the ancient liturgies, agreeing in all points of doctrine with the liturgy of the English Church," our readers would like to know what it is like.

"Ten years after the establishment of the new Prussian church, Bishop Eylert, of Potsdam, published a defence (1830) and explanation of its principle and working. According to the reverend author's view, the merit of his new liturgy (he was one of the composers of it) *consists mainly* in the historical presentation of the sacramental elements of the Lord's supper: in the consecration of the elements in the Lutheran and in the Calvinistic church, it is distinctly announced to the communicant in what sense it is presented to him;—in the one, it is as the body and blood; in the other, it is as the symbols of the body and blood. The synod of Berlin evaded the dilemma by not consecrating the elements at all, either in the one or the other sense, but presenting them to the communicant with the historical averment, 'Christ said, This is my body,' &c. 'Christ said, This is my blood,' &c.—that is, in its being so presented that *each denomination of Christians may take it, and apply his own meaning to it.*—Pp. 37, 38. (Ueber den Werth, und die Wirkung des Evangelische Kirche, &c.)—The reverend bishop forgets that, so taken, it is no sacrament at all: it is only a reference to an historical fact, not to any religious signification of that fact, such as Catholics, Lutherans, and Calvinists attach to it, however widely they may differ from each other as to what that signification is, or ought to be. On his principle, Jew, Gentile, or Mahometan, might receive the Sacrament from him, and remain Jew, Gentile, or Mahometan; for it is only presented to him as figuring an historical fact,—not at all doubted, and not at all connected with any peculiar doctrine attached to that fact. This courtly divinity may suit the meridian of Potsdam, but is not christian divinity."—*Laing*, pp. 188, 189.

Hard words, Mr. Laing, but worse remain; he calls this device of Bishop Eylert a "church trick" (p. 183), "a jesuitical side-door, through which slender consciences, if not the robust, of both Lutherans and Calvinists, could slip in and go to the table, and slip out, and each take the sacrament, and please his Majesty, without offence to his own church doctrines" (p. 185); "a quirk unworthy of the act" (p. 186); "no union of the Calvinistic and Lutheran churches, but a hocus-pocus trick; a knavish way of getting rid of the difficulty; a deception as to doctrine and meaning; a form having no reference to any doctrine; a fiction; a very good cloak." (*Ibid.*) We are quoting Mr. Laing; we say nothing; but it is quite clear that he does not think that the new Prussian liturgy "agrees in all points of doctrine with the English Church;" and it is equally clear that Bishop Eylert cannot think so, for he says distinctly, in his twelve grounds of vindication, that "the new liturgy differs in no essentials of doctrine from the liturgies used in the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches;" unless Bishop Eylert is prepared to say that the Anglican doctrine, and the Lutheran doctrine, and the Calvinistic doctrine, on the Eucharist, are all one and the same thing, a position which we never heard maintained, though, as we have fallen upon strange times, we may live to see it.

This new sacramental form was first used by the late king, 31st October, 1817, and from Mr. Rose's book, p. 252, we learn that the union of the two communities and a similar "historical" administration was introduced into Baden in 1821, and into other parts of Germany at different periods of the century.

But we have not yet done with the new prayer-book of the new church. It was first framed in 1822.

"The ministers of the new church are prohibited in the agenda from occupying more than one hour in the whole service, and the liturgy is to occupy one half hour. The sermon consequently can scarcely have more than twenty or twenty-five minutes, which is totally insufficient, they assert, for conveying christian instruction. They are also prohibited by the new agenda from using any introductory or concluding prayer to the sermon—the most important and effective parts of the old service, both in the Lutheran and Calvinistic church."—P. 201.

"The following is the order of the service in the new Prussian church. There is an altar railed in, and covered with an altar cloth. *Two lighted wax candles and a crucifix stand upon the altar, and behind and around it are pictures of saints and holy subjects, as in a Roman Catholic church.* The only difference observable is, that the priest at the altar is in a plain black gown, instead of the embroidered robes in which the Catholic priest officiates. He reads the new liturgy standing with his back against the altar, and facing the people. The amen to each prayer is finely quavered out by the choristers behind the altar, and the 'Halleluia,' the 'Holy, holy, holy,' the 'Glory to God in the highest,' &c., are delivered with great musical effect, as might be expected in so musical a land."—*Ibid.*

"The *Kurie Eleison* [sic], and other operatic quaverings in the new service, are, it is said, borrowed from the Greek church, the late king having, when on a visit to Russia, been much pleased with those parts of the Greek service."—Pp. 217, 218.

"So little has it been intended that the congregation should take a part in this new service, that no books of the liturgy equivalent to the English Common Prayer-book are in their hands. The liturgy is for the clergyman only, and is not even to be got at the booksellers' shops.\* The only book of public worship in the hands of the congregation, is the *Gesang buch*. This is a sort of hymn-book, in doggrel verse, which supersedes the Psalms of David and the paraphrases of portions of Scripture used in our church services. It is printed as prose, but each clause of a sentence is a line rhyming to another clause. It is divided into sections and sentences, which are numbered; and the numbers being stuck up in conspicuous parts of the church, the congregation on entering sees what is to be sung without the minister or clerk giving out the place and verse. The whole part that the congregation has to take in the public worship by the new service, is to sing or chaunt a portion of this *Gesang buch* with the accompaniment of the organ, before the minister comes to the altar to read the liturgy, and again in the interval between the liturgy and the sermon. This *Gesang buch* is not a collection of versions or paraphrases of any particular passages of the Old and New Testament, nor have its hymns the slightest reference to Scripture, or any biblical allusion or phraseology. It is no doubt

---

\* This must be our own apology, for adopting only Mr. L.'s extracts from the Prussian service-book. London cannot produce a copy. We have sent to Berlin for one; and perhaps our readers may see more of it.

distilled from the Scriptures, but it carefully avoids giving any flavour of its origin. . . . The people have nothing but this *Gesang buch* as necessary in their public worship, and a meagre childish composition it is, altogether unworthy of being the manual of devotion, and suitable rather for an infant school than for a congregation of grown-up Christians."—Pp. 202, 203.

This we think unfair: some parts of the *Gesang buch* are simple and beautiful.

"The German language is now so generally studied, that a specimen of the *Gesang buch* will enable most readers to judge for themselves of this Prussian substitute for the Psalms of David. By giving its exact English synonyme below each German word, the English reader even may be able to form some idea of its style and merits:—

"XXXIV. 1. Jesus wir erscheinen hier deine Sussigkeit zu schmecken!  
 Jesus we appear here thy sweetness to taste!  
 deine Gnad erheben wir Herz und Ohren zu erwecken: dass wir deine  
 thy grace solicit we heart and ears to awaken: that we thy  
 Himmelslehren uns zum Trost mit Freuden hören.  
 heaven-teaching us to comfort with joy may hear.

"2. Oefne deines Dieners Mund, gieb ihm deines Geistes Gaben, dass er  
 Open thy servant's mouth, give him thy Spirit's gifts, that he  
 mag aus Herzens-grund, mit des Wortes Kraft uns laben, und dass uns die  
 may out of heart-ground, with the word's power us refresh, and that us the  
 Himmels-speise stark auf unser Pilger-reise.  
 heaven-food may strengthen on our pilgrim-journey.

"3. Dir dem Vater und dem Geist soll das Herz geheiligt werden,  
 To thee the Father and the Spirit shall the heart dedicated be,  
 hilf nur dass wir allermeist uns erheben von der Erden, um mit innigen  
 help only that we most especially us raise from the earth, for with inward  
 Verlangen deine Gaben zu empfangen.  
 desire thy gifts to receive."—Pp. 203, 204.

Be it observed, that the above is metrical and in rhyme.

"In the afternoon there is no service at the altar, no liturgical prayers as in the Church of England, but there is a section of the *Gesang buch* sung, the Lord's prayer, a sermon, the Lord's prayer again, and the blessing, and another portion of the *Gesang buch* sung, which constitute the evening service. This radical division in the church service appears to have formed a similar division in the religious state of the people. You see some going to church to hear the liturgy, and going out when it is finished, as having gone through all that is essential in religious duties: others, again, are going in when the liturgy is over, or go to the evening service only, as the sermon, and not the ceremonial, is to them the essential. The junction of the two distinct principles in one service is as incongruous as it would be to bind the New Testament and Dr. Strauss' *Life of Jesus* in one volume."—P. 207.

"In the two distinct services tacked together in this new Prussian church, that which addresses itself to the mind of the congregation, the sermon, is by no means left in free action. It is not only shorn of its introductory and concluding prayers appropriate to the subject preached, and which the twelve ministers consider the most valuable privilege of their former Lutheran church, from its beneficial effect on their congregations, and it is not only confined in time, by church rule given out by the state, to half an hour, but the text on which alone the ministers throughout all the kingdom are allowed to preach, is appointed on all fast days, or particular church days, by government—that is to say, it is given out to the ministers by the consistory of each province, of which

consistory the head and president is the high president of the province, the equivalent functionary to the préfet commanding in civil, military, and ecclesiastical affairs, according to his orders from the general government."—Pp. 208, 209.

All this too may be, for aught we know, to agree in all points of doctrine with the English Church, "lighted wax candles, crucifix," and all; but what would the "Marylebone Operative Protestant Association," that power in the church (as somebody said of something behind the throne), greater than the church itself, say to it?

And this is the new Prussian evangelical church, and this its liturgy and *agenda*. The Lutheran and Calvinistic names, and churches, and the term Protestant, are no more; an "order from the Minister of Home Affairs," (like one of Buonaparte's—"The house of Braganza has ceased to reign,") signed their death-warrant. In 1830 the prayer-book was introduced into all the churches; and in 1834 an edict prohibits *any* Protestant religious meetings—the old Lutheran among the rest—which do not use it. But considerable opposition met the new form of worship at first. Some of the tatters of old electorates pieced into the new web of Prussia, had old "Protestant rights," which they scrupled at resigning; the liberals began to think that though political centralization might be a good thing, this ecclesiastical legislation was not only "imposing arbitrary shackles on the human mind," but it was to make every state sovereign a home pope; the old Lutherans looked askance at their new brethren; Schliermacher objected; some magistrates remonstrated; and twelve ministers protested; though, after all, the resistance did not amount to much; rationalism had done its work; indifference was tolerably general; the king's commands were strong; and the barrack and parade obedience of Prussia was ready, in some cases from ignorance, and in most from carelessness, to accept anything and everything from headquarters; and so, out of 8,950 Protestant congregations in Prussia, 7,750 joined the union; and of the rest, the 1,200 recusants, we do not hear much; some, we suppose, were persuaded,—and there was one plan which rather reminded us of another great Head of the Church—Henry VIII.—and the six articles. Good King Frederic William III. had an army to keep, and a church to plant, and dissenters to reclaim, so he wisely contrived to combine all these separate duties; but we prefer Mr. Laing's account of it.

"Forgetting that by his proclamation of 1817 he wants the union to be brought about 'neither by persuasion, nor indifference, but by inward conviction,' the new form of service was introduced with armed force, all objections to it were crushed as treasonable, and on some poor villages in Silesia, which obstinately refused to exchange the old Lutheran service for the new, troops were quartered on the people to be supported at their expense—that is, to live in free quarters, as if they were enemies in the land, until the people conformed. The people were ruined, and a few of these poor martyrs, about six hundred in number, calling themselves old Lutherans, found their way by Hamburgh and Hull to America—the last of the religious martyrs, it is to be hoped, whom the persecution of a despot will drive to her forests."—P. 188.



This scheme of comprehension is by no means new in the annals of the Lutheran and Reformed bodies. The convocation of Torgau, 1574, was designed to unite the Crypto-Calvinists of Saxony with the Lutherans, as well as to heal the divisions among the Lutherans themselves, although its immediate results seem to have been that the churches of Nassau and Hanau, and in 1595 the princes of Anhalt, and in 1604 Maurice, landgrave of Hesse, deserted the Lutheran for the Reformed community. His example was followed, in 1614, by the memorable defection of John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg. Through Peter du Moulin our King James, who enjoyed a theological fight with a zest as keen as that of his predecessor for a bear-baiting, interfered to promote an union of the two rival bodies; Sigismund attempted the same; a conference was held at Charenton in 1631, and another at Leipzig in the same year, at the instigation of Sigismund's successor, the elector George William; the King of Poland held a diet at Thorn, in which pacific measure Rome was invited to join, and a conference at Cassel, in 1661, was promoted by the elector Frederic William the Great, son of George William, for the same comprehensive purpose; the learning and piety of Calixtus was expended in vain, and the name of Syncrétism is the only memorial of one whose piety and earnestness formed the delightful but visionary scheme—alas! must it ever be so?—of uniting the Reformed, the Lutheran, and Romish communions. The learned Lutheran Pfaff revived the project in 1723; but before this, Frederic, the son of Frederic William the Great, encouraged Ursinus, in 1705, to enter into negotiations with the English Church to promote the comprehension of the two foreign communities by means of the English Church. It was proposed to introduce into Prussia the English liturgy, which was actually translated for the purpose, and communicated to Tennison. The manuscript and proposal seem to have miscarried; the king took affront, and Tennison, who really appears to have been ignorant of the whole matter, bore, though unjustly, the blame of coldness in the affair.\* It was renewed afterwards by Jablonski to Sharp, archbishop of York, through Smalridge, afterwards dean of Christ Church and bishop of Bristol. The project was entertained favourably by Sharp, an excellent prelate, in whose life a long and interesting correspondence on the subject is inserted; and it failed finally by the death of the king in 1713, and that of Sharp in 1714.

Jablonski was the father of the well-known author of the "*Pantheon Ægyptiacum*," and an able and excellent person; he had

---

\* It is said that the celebrated Grabe was sent into England by this monarch for consecration. Richardson, the editor of Godwin, tells the story; but this could not have been the case, for Grabe was settled at Oxford in 1697, before Frederic's accession; he left Prussia voluntarily, on account of dissatisfaction with the Lutheran defect of succession: and his unflinching orthodoxy, which he displayed by joining the non-jurors, must have rendered him a very untractable instrument for the pacific measure in question.

personal reasons for recommending the introduction of the episcopate into Prussia, for he was himself senior or bishop of the Polish church, in point of fact of the Moravians, who derive a fancied succession from a certain Catholic bishop who is said to have turned Protestant in the time of J. Huss. This succession was just as false as that of the Swedish bishops (which puzzled even Leslie), though it seems to have satisfied Jablonski, for he adverts to it with great complacency in one of his letters; but it was clearly not sufficient for Frederic, who allowed him to carry it on by consecrating bishops (so called) for Poland, while he never thought of applying to this source for the projected Prussian episcopate. Altogether this scheme promised better than the others; it was countenanced and assisted by the celebrated Leibnitz, whose opinions of the doctrinal orthodoxy of the Roman faith, and his desire for union between her and the Reformed bodies, if it could be accomplished with justice, are a sufficient guarantee for his Catholic views. Frederic William revived the plan of comprehension in 1736, on the one hand proposing to remove the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination; on the other, giving up the Lutheran ceremonial; but without success. Religion seems to have been banished during the reign of Frederic, miscalled the Great; poetry, philosophy, Voltaire, and war, were more congenial to his temper than theological pacification; and it is no wonder that Frederic William II., in 1788, soon after his accession, was obliged to issue the famous religious edict (Rose, p. 183), complaining of Lutheran licentiousness in doctrine, their assumption of a tone contrary to Christianity, and their revival of Socinianism, Deism, &c. Even during the storm of war which desolated his kingdom, the late king of Prussia, Frederic William III., entertained the plan of introducing a general liturgy; his very first act which accompanied the peace of 1814 was to issue a proclamation on the subject, and the result we have already seen in the act of 1817. Of its success, we must once more quote our author.

"The forced amalgamation of the Lutheran and Calvinistic churches into this third thing, neither Lutheran nor Calvinistic, and the abolition of the very name of the Protestant church in Prussia, is undoubtedly the most gratuitous, unhappy, and senseless act of irresponsible despotism ever exercised over, and submitted to, by a christian people in civilized times. There is much in a name. With the abolition of the name of the Protestant religion, this government has effected what emperors and popes could not do—has nearly destroyed the Protestant religion itself in Germany, and with it almost all religion. The ancient liturgy of the Lutheran, the freely out-poured prayer of the Calvinist, being both silenced in the land, the mind of the great mass of the people had nothing Christian to hold by, nothing in religion venerated as doctrines or practices of worship from former times, from respected associations with the sufferings or deeds of their forefathers. Infidelity, Deism, Straussism, and all the other forms and shapes which unbelief in Christianity can assume in the speculative, dreaming, German mind, have had free play. Protestantism as a church, and even as a name, being abolished in Prussia, Christianity was left for its defences to the antiquated bulwark of the Roman Catholic faith. The middle ground between gross superstition and gross infidelity, on which the two Protestant churches were planted, was seized for state purposes to build this new Prussian

church upon. The spread, in the same age, of Catholicism on one hand, and of infidelity on the other—the Catholic priest making converts on one side of the street, and Dr. Strauss on the other—shows a religious condition of the German people, which the traveller finds as unaccountable as it is undeniable, until he traces it as a natural consequence of this act of his late Prussian majesty, which cast loose at once all the ties which had held the public mind fast for three centuries to one or other of the two Protestant churches.”—Pp. 207, 208.

If our readers are desirous of further details of the persecution which welcomed the new Prussian service-book into the churches, besides what we have supplied at pp. 388, 389, they will find it in a little book, “Persecution of the Lutheran Church,” translated by Löwenberg, and published about eighteen months ago. Ministers suspended—dismissed—fined—imprisoned—starved;—the Countess Heukel and other ladies, condemned to imprisonment as rebels;—twenty dollars’ fine imposed for a single attendance on the old Lutheran service;—five dollars a month if a peasant has his child confirmed by a Lutheran minister of the old school;—churches stormed;—women beaten and cut down by the sabres of the cavalry;—this is the peaceful birth of the state church of Prussia.

At this moment, when it is generally rumoured that the present king, Frederic William IV., is about to obtain a Prussian episcopate from this church—when he has already, in conjunction with some of our bishops, founded a Pruss-Anglican bishopric at Jerusalem—we trust that these tedious details will not be unacceptable to our readers. It beseems us not to inquire how far political reasons, and the desire, by means of his church, to erect an antagonist power to Russia and Austria, may influence him. Indeed, we have not space for the examination, which we had proposed to extend to these and kindred topics, by means of Messrs. Hope and Palmer, Mr. Maurice, and Dr. Hook. Above all, it behoves us well, before it is too late, to *inquire into the nature of this Prussian liturgy*, and to examine most rigidly the doctrinal purity of the new Prussian establishment. We have ventured to suggest a few hints on this head. We have been told by something like authority, that “the Church of England, by origin and doctrine, is most intimately akin to the German evangelical church;” from Mr. Laing’s account, are we prepared to recognise the family likeness; can we say of what it is becoming the fashion to call sister-churches—

“ ——— facies non omnibus una,  
Nec diversa tamen, qualis decet esse sororum?”

Can we identify the spirit of persecution, which has conduced to the present apparent calm of this religious body, with that peaceful growth in holy things, the earnest of the presence of the Holy Spirit, which would accept the Episcopate as the highest and most heavenly blessing? Are we satisfied with its present results? The whole scheme is of the bureau, not of the altar: it is the court, not the clergy, which is on the move: the people might *accept* bishops as they did the new service; are they praying for them? Above all,

*what guarantee have we of Prussian orthodoxy?* Is it the Augsburg Confession? rating this even higher than we are disposed to do, the faith of a church is to be learned from its ritual, not from polemical confessions. We have already gained some insight into this service-book; and a fact, from which Mr. Laing (p. 205,) deduces a false inference, is to us very significant of its general spirit and soundness. It is this.

The new service approaches much more nearly to the Lutheran doctrines than to those of the Reformed body; and yet the opposition to it is all on the Lutheran side: they alone are dissatisfied, though, as far as externals go, they have it all their own way. How is this, but that there is some principle admitted which offends the more orthodox body, which the Lutheran unquestionably is, and which smooths all difficulties for the Calvinists? How else are we to dispose of the fact, which is a startling one, that the Reformed, who have been accustomed to no preconceived service at all, submit without a murmur to a ceremonial, which to them can differ very little from what they conceive of the Mass—and, on the other hand, the Lutherans object to what, in appearance, they have used since Luther's time? There must be a difference; and if it is the abandonment of any truth to conciliate Genevan doctrine, which we strongly suspect, it is high time for us to look most sharply into the whole matter, unless we are prepared to retrace our steps, and for the first time since the Reformation, commit ourselves to Swiss theology.

And here we dismiss Mr. Laing; accepting with gratitude his facts—estimating very highly his talents—and detesting his principles. We cannot, in parting, but rebuke him very earnestly for introducing a disgusting disquisition on “Checks on over-population,” which we cannot trust ourselves to characterise as it deserves. He says, with great truth, that “there are some subjects which it is difficult to treat with decency of expression:” it beseems a Christian then to hold his tongue about them; which Mr. Laing, to his great disgrace, has not done. And we might have been spared some filthy details respecting a flagitious sect, the recent growth of “Evangelical” Prussia, called the Muckers, whose religion consists in sensual lewdness, which, while it finds a parallel in Otaheitan heathenism, too forcibly recalls the abominable history of some ancient heretics. There are things “of which it is a shame even to speak;” and these are of them.

*Correspondence between the Foreign Aid Society of London, and the Sociétés Évangéliques of Paris and Geneva.* London: Macintosh, Great New-street, 1841.

AMONG many perplexing features in the aspect of our times, it is a consolatory circumstance, that thoughtful members of the Church of England, though differing widely among themselves, are beginning almost universally to feel that our position in the christian world is unsatisfactory. The truth is forcing itself upon many minds, that the existence of divisions and separations, not merely within the limits of a single nation, but in the christian world, is a crying sin; and that every particular church which acquiesces in a state of separation from those whom she acknowledges for brethren, or does not labour (within her sphere) for the conversion and reformation of those whom she holds to have departed from the brotherhood, makes herself a party to the sin. It is beginning to be felt, that no formal diversities, or variations of opinion, which are consistent with the existence of a true church of Christ, can justify any other church in refusing to hold religious communion with those who receive and practise them; and that, on the other hand, no terms may be kept with those who have departed from the faith, but that all true churches are bound to set a mark upon them as heathens and publicans, and bring them back, if possible, by active proselytism, into the fold. It is felt, too, that churches which desire religious communion and reconciliation with other churches from which they are estranged, ought to seek it, or at least do something to promote it; and that if they do not, some responsibility will rest upon them for the continuance of the estrangement, whoever may have been to blame for its commencement.

We do not mean to profess a belief that these principles are now distinctly held by the generality of English churchmen; but we believe them to be acquiring power over many minds at once, and in different directions. It is difficult to see how they should fail to affect all, who use with sincerity the daily prayer, "Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven," and remember the last words spoken by our Lord Jesus Christ, on the same night that he was betrayed, before he went into the garden where his Passion was to begin:—"Holy Father, keep through Thine own Name those whom Thou hast given Me, that they may be one, as We are. . . . Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on Me through their word; that they all may be one; as Thou, Father, art in Me, and I in Thee, that they also may be one in Us; that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me. And the glory which Thou gavest Me, I have given them; that they may be one, even as We are one: I in them, and Thou in Me, that they may be made perfect in one; and that the world may know that Thou hast sent me, and hast loved them, as Thou hast loved Me." Even if love for the Saviour, or fear of the responsibility of counteracting His will, did not

furnish sufficient motives, the thought which these words suggest, that the success of christian missions to the heathen (not to say the continuance of a belief in Christ in the nominally christian world) may essentially depend upon the preservation of unity and concord in the Church, ought to kindle zeal for the restoration of unity in every breast.

We are disposed to give credit for such feelings as these to certain gentlemen who have formed a society which they entitle "The Foreign Aid Society, for promoting the objects of the European Sociétés Evangéliques," and who have recently published an "Important Correspondence," which, if it justified their description of it, would be important indeed; for they speak of it as "pointing out a true basis of christian union." We have read this correspondence with interest, and now propose to examine it by those principles of unity which we have already adverted to, practically applied according to the four principal rules of limitation which appear upon the surface of holy Scripture. 1. That we must not unite with those who deliberately disobey the revealed will of God, (John xiv. 21; 1 Cor. xvi. 22.) 2. That we must not unite with those who reject any part of the necessary Faith originally delivered to the Church, (Gal. i. 8, 9; 1 Tim. vi. 3—6; 2 John 10, 11.) 3. That we must not unite with those who reject the Church, or despise the lawful authority of her commissioned ministers, (Matt. xviii. 17; Luke x. 16.) 4. That we must not unite with those who "walk disorderly, contrary to the tradition received from the apostles," or who "cause divisions and offences, contrary to the doctrine which we have learned," (2 Thess. iii. 6; Rom. xvi. 17.)

The object which these gentlemen propose to themselves, is nothing less than the union of the Reformed Churches of the continent with our own, "in one common confession of the truth as it is in Jesus." Having learned that "for more than sixteen months" the Société Evangélique of Geneva had been "anxious to promote a union among those who individually make a good confession of the faith as restored at the Reformation," they addressed, on the 16th of August, 1841, two letters, dated "10, Exeter Hall," to the Committees of that Society and of the Société Evangélique at Paris. These letters were signed by seven laymen, and by the following priests:—the Rev. R. Burgess, the Rev. J. W. Cunningham, the Rev. E. Bickersteth, and the Rev. H. Hughes. No bishop appears to be a member of the English Society, or to have been consulted about its proceedings. The letters, however, were such in tone and language as might be expected from persons clothed with apostolic authority. That to Geneva began as follows:—

"To the brethren, members of the Committee, &c., the Committee of the Foreign Aid Society in London sends greeting; Grace be unto you, and peace from God our Father and the Lord Jesus Christ.—Beloved brethren, we have heard of the increase of your faith, and hope, and love, for which we cease not to give thanks."



Then, after referring, in terms which we shall presently quote, to the doctrine of the Helvetic Confession and Catechism, it proceeds :—

“ We, therefore, having deliberated upon these matters, and heartily desirous of bringing our brethren in England to cooperate with us in aiding your efforts for the furtherance of the gospel, have requested our honorary secretary, who is about to depart for the continent, to solicit your serious attention to matters which he is instructed to lay before you touching Confessions of Faith and the union of Churches. And we have desired him to bring back to us, that we may present the same to the clergy of our beloved Church, a public declaration of your faith, and of your adherence to those great doctrines which were once held by the Church of Geneva.”

Their object in seeking for this declaration, the English Committee declare to be, not any design of putting a yoke upon the Genevese Society, but that they may be enabled to “ put to silence those who affirm that you do not hold the faith unfeigned.”

We shall not stop to inquire whether it is a lawful thing for laymen and priests, living under episcopal authority, to take so much upon them as seems to be assumed in this letter. There is something startling in the tone of this particular document ; and to some it may perhaps appear irreverent and presumptuous. It would manifestly be unsuitable to individuals, or a society seeking only to enlarge their own or the common stock of information, or to exchange an expression of sympathy with others like-minded with themselves. But we do not see on what principles it can be objected to, if the act to which it belongs, the opening of a formal negotiation for unity with a foreign religious community, is admitted to be one which it was competent for these gentlemen to undertake ; and again, we do not see how it is possible to vindicate the constitution and practice of the greater number of our religious societies, without admitting the competency of any voluntary association of laymen and clergymen to undertake such a work as this, upon the mere suggestion of their own inward sense of duty. So that, if these gentlemen have done what cannot be strictly justified, they have been encouraged to do so by prevailing opinions and practices ; and by doing it in a more religious and solemn way than usual, they seem to us only to have shown that they appreciate more clearly than others the character and nature of the office and function which they assume.

It is of importance, (since we are told to look in this correspondence for a “ true basis of union,”) to inquire on what notion of requisites to unity they have proceeded.

“ We have great joy,” they say to the Genevese Committee, “ in learning that the Lord has raised up among you faithful servants, who are very zealous of restoring the Reformed Churches of the continent to ‘ the faith once delivered to the saints,’ the chief points of which are summed up in the Helvetic Confession of Faith, and the Catechism so long in use in the Church of Geneva. We have compared these formularies with our Thirty-nine Articles of religion, and, with the exception of some minor points relative to ecclesiastical order and discipline, we find a remarkable concord. The Reformers of our Church and the Reformers of your country speak the

same thing, and are of one mind with respect to all the essential doctrines of our holy religion; and we feel convinced that no other bond of union would be required to bring us into fraternal communion."

To the same effect, and almost in the same words, they write to their Parisian correspondents, substituting only the general expression, "the doctrines of your Reformers," for the mention of a definite Confession.

In this remarkable declaration there are three things to be observed, on which we shall make no comment beyond simply pointing them out. First, the writers of these letters assume agreement in the confession of a common doctrine to be a sufficient bond of christian union, without taking any notice of that other condition, distinguished from and superadded to orthodoxy of doctrine in Scripture—continuance "in the apostles' fellowship;" as we should interpret it, continuance in the communion of the Apostolic Church. Secondly, they consider that no essential difference from the English Church is involved in such passages of the Helvetic Confession, as those which express the doctrine of Reprobation, or those which state that, as to the Grace conveyed, or the Thing signified, there is absolutely no difference between Circumcision and Baptism, or the Passover and the Lord's Supper, (Helv. Conf. x. xix.) And lastly, they consider that the differences from the English Church expressed by such passages as, (1.) "*Data est omnibus in ecclesiâ ministris una et æqualis potestas sive functio;*" and (2.) "*Confirmatio et extrema unctio inventa sunt hominum, quibus nullo cum damno carere potest ecclesia; neque illa nos in nostris ecclesiis habemus; nam habent illa quædam, quæ minimè probare possumus,*" (Helv. Conf. xviii. xix.); relate merely to "minor points" of "ecclesiastical order and discipline." If this judgment is right, doubtless the conclusion is right too, that such differences ought not to be obstacles to a cordial unity.

We now come to the replies elicited by these letters from the Committees at Geneva and Paris, to which they were addressed; replies so satisfactory to the London Committee, that, after printing them, they conclude with the following appeal:—

"To the above satisfactory and affecting declaration of our foreign brethren, the Committee will add nothing; but will seriously ask all who hold the truth as it is in Jesus, whether those who profess and are contending earnestly for such doctrines, are not entitled to the help and sympathy of our beloved Church established in this country, and of all who love the Lord Jesus Christ in sincerity?"

Let us examine the reply of the Genevese Committee. Much of it is occupied with generalities and introductory matter, of which we should take no notice, were it not for one remarkable passage, expressing just the view of the Church of England which the communication made to them would naturally suggest.

"To this joy," they say, "is added another, which is, that this appeal comes to us from ministers and members of the Church of England; . . .

of that Church, which God has placed in his heritage as one of the most powerful bulwarks against the invasions of the Papacy; of that Church, which, whether by her immediate efforts, or by those of Christians who have gone forth from her bosom, (and whom, notwithstanding some differences, we please ourselves at our distance in identifying with her,) has planted the standard of Jesus Christ in vast continents and in the most distant islands; of that Church, the purity of whose doctrine, its power, its constitution, (?) its greatness, and the important sphere which Divine Providence has assigned her, makes us justly regard her as the elder sister of the Churches of the Reformation; finally, of that Church, which, by the Foreign Aid Society especially, manifests towards the other evangelical churches of the continent so cordial an affection, and such brotherly support."

We agree in the opinion here implied, that, upon the principles of the Foreign Aid Society, a large proportion of the English dissenting communities ought to be included in the contemplated union; and we would suggest to the English Committee, that as natives of Great Britain, they are far more directly called upon to exert themselves for the establishment of intercommunion between the Church of England and those dissenting communities, (together with the Presbyterians of Scotland,) than to procure her reconciliation with the Protestants of Switzerland and France. The maxim, that "charity begins at home," cannot be without its application in religion as well as in other things.

But let us pass from all preliminary matter to the main point, the question of doctrine. The Geneva Committee, (modestly, though we scarcely see on what principle, declining the title of a church, and contenting themselves with that of a school,) declare their belief to be, that "*the fundamental truths of the christian religion,*" "*the capital fundamental doctrines,*" are none other than those "which the Protestant Churches proclaim *with common consent* in their Confessions of Faith," upon the five following subjects:—(1.) *The state of man*; (2.) *The grace of God*; (3.) *The nature of the Saviour*; (4.) *The work which he has accomplished*; (5.) *The work which he still carries on for the salvation of his people*. What these doctrines are they proceed to state.

Upon the first head, they express their agreement with "the Protestant Churches, and those of France in particular;" quoting from the French Confession of 1559, to the effect that, by the Fall, the nature of man "is entirely corrupted," and "his will always under subjection to sin." This, therefore, is what they hold to be one of the fundamental Truths of the christian religion, and *the whole fundamental Truth with respect to "the state of Man."* Catholic Christians need not be reminded that, important as the Truth upon this subject unquestionably is, no symbolical expression of it is to be found in any one of the creeds received by the Church.

Upon the second head, they express their agreement with the 17th Article of the Church of England, on Predestination. This, therefore, is, in their judgment, another fundamental Truth, and *the whole*

*fundamental Truth with respect to the "grace of God."* Again, Catholic Christians need not be reminded that there is no article about Predestination or Election in any one of the Three Creeds.

Upon the third head, "the nature of the Saviour," they declare their agreement with "the Protestant Churches, and those of Germany in particular, in the famous Confession of Augsburg," to the following effect:—

"We hold and teach that there is one only Divine Being, who is truly God; and that there are, nevertheless, three persons in this one only Divine Being, equal in power, equal in eternity, God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost . . . God the Son became man, born of the Virgin Mary, and he united in one person, in a manner inseparable, the two natures, human and divine; so that there is but one Christ, who is truly God and truly Man."

This, upon the most fundamental article of Christianity, is their substitution for the Catholic Creeds. It might have been expected that they would have taken this opportunity of declaring their adhesion to the Nicene Faith. They knew that a multitude of Protestant congregations all around them, in Geneva, in France, in Germany, which originally took their stand upon the Confessions of the sixteenth century, have lapsed into the very heresies which the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds were drawn up to exclude. Yet, so far are they from throwing themselves back upon those bulwarks of orthodoxy, that they even modify the Augsburg statement for the worse; omitting the recognition of the Nicene Creed, which that document contains; excluding the words in which it asserts the consubstantiality of the Three Persons in the Trinity; and introducing an almost Sabellian phraseology, while they dispense with the words by which, in the Confession, that heresy is distinctly guarded against.\*

Upon the fourth head, they express their agreement with "the Protestant Churches, the Presbyterian Churches of Scotland and America in particular," referring to chapters 8 and 11 of the "Confession of Faith of the Church of Scotland." The passages intended do not appear in the printed Correspondence; we presume them to include the statements of the Scottish Confession concerning the office of the Saviour, as a "Mediator and Surety," His subjection to and fulfilment of the law, His Passion, Crucifixion, Death, Burial, Resurrection with the same body in which He suffered, Ascension with the same body, Glorification and Intercession at the right hand

---

\* The following are the words in the Augsburg Confession (1531). "*Ecclesie magno consensu apud nos docent, decretum Nicenæ synodi, de unitate essentiæ Divinæ, et de tribus Personis, verum et sine ullâ dubitatione credendum esse. Videlicet, quod sit una essentia Divina, quæ appellatur et est Deus, æternus, incorporeus, impartibilis, immensâ potentiâ, sapientiâ, bonitate, creator et conservator omnium rerum visibilium et invisibilium, et tamen tres sunt Personæ, ejusdem essentiæ et potentiæ, et coeternæ, Pater, Filius, et Spiritus Sanctus. Et nomine Personæ utuntur eâ significatione, quâ usi sunt in hac causâ scriptores ecclesiastici, ut significet non partem aut qualitatem in alio, sed quod proprie subsistit.*"

of the Father, thence "to return and judge men and angels at the end of the world;" the statement that "the Lord Jesus, by His perfect obedience, and sacrifice of Himself, which He, through the eternal Spirit, once offered up to God, hath fully satisfied the justice of His Father, and purchased not only reconciliation, but an everlasting inheritance in the kingdom of heaven, for all those whom the Father hath given unto Him," (Westm. Confession, 8;) and the whole of the 11th chapter, which sets forth the doctrines, (1.) of the free justification of "those whom God effectually calleth," "not by infusing righteousness into them," but "by imputing the obedience and satisfaction of Christ unto them, they receiving and resting on Him and His righteousness by Faith, the alone instrument of justification;" "which faith they have not of themselves, it is the gift of God." (2.) The doctrine that "Christ, by His obedience and death, did fully discharge the debt of *all those that are thus justified*, and did make a proper, real, and full satisfaction to His Father's justice in *their behalf*." (3.) The doctrine that "God did, from all eternity, decree to justify all the elect, and Christ did, in the fulness of time, die for their sins, and rise again for their justification; nevertheless, they are not justified until the Holy Spirit doth in due time actually apply Christ unto them." And (4.) The doctrine that "God doth continue to forgive the sins of those that are justified; and," although they may sin from time to time, and have continual occasion for repentance, "*they can never fall from the state of justification*." This, then, is what the Committee at Geneva hold to be *fundamental doctrine, and the whole of fundamental doctrine*, upon the subject of "the work which the Saviour has accomplished;" and here, as before, though they agree to a certain extent with the Catholic Creeds, they in some respects fall short of them, in others go beyond them, and in some most important particulars (as to the Catholic doctrines, that Christ died and made satisfaction for *all men*, and that we shall be *judged by our works*) contradict their evident meaning.

Upon the fifth and last head, they express their agreement with "the Protestant Churches, and the Reformed Helvetic Church in particular;" to the effect that, "a third state in which we ought to consider man, is that of regeneration;" that "the understanding of regenerate believers is enlightened," and "their will freed, by the Holy Spirit;" that "the regenerate, when they choose the good, *do not only experience the power of God which leads them thereto, but they feel that they act themselves, of their own inclination, and with delight*;" that "there remains always some weakness even in the regenerate," but that "still, *as the passions have no longer sufficient strength to quench the fire of the Divine Spirit, the regenerate are regarded as free*, but in such wise, that they ought unceasingly to feel their weakness." Nothing is here said about baptism. They hold, therefore, that the doctrines of a conscious experience of regeneration, and of the indefectibility of the regenerate, are capital fundamental truths; and that the view above given represents *the*

*whole of fundamental truth, as to* "the work which the Saviour now carries on for the salvation of His People, or the work of Regeneration."

And this is the whole necessary Truth, according to these gentlemen; this is that declaration of Faith, which appears satisfactory to the Committee of the London Foreign Aid Society, and by which they expect to convince gainsayers that the Société Evangélique of Geneva consists of men who hold "the Truth unfeigned;" this is that "true basis of union," which is to reconcile the Church of England to the Protestants of Geneva and France;—we say of France also, for the French Committee, in a more vague and less explicit way, gave an answer which we suppose was intended to convey the same meaning; referring generally for the essence of the Faith to the points *in which all the Protestant Confessions were agreed*. Let us examine this basis of union by the test of the gospel "which we have received;" let us compare this Protestant definition of "fundamentals," with the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds.

First, it *adds* to the fundamentals set forth in those Creeds, a variety of modern definitions and dogmas, concerning the effect of the Fall upon human nature, the loss and recovery of Free Will by men, Predestination and Election, Particular Redemption, Justification by imputed righteousness through the Gift of Faith, the indefectibility of the Justified or Regenerate, and the conscious experiences of the Regenerate; none of which are to be found in any symbol of fundamental doctrine ever set forth before the sixteenth century, and some of which apparently contradict the tenor of the Nicene and Athanasian Creeds.

Secondly, it takes away from the category of fundamentals, upon the lowest computation, the following ELEVEN articles of the three Catholic Creeds:—(Apostles') 1. The Descent of our Saviour into Hell. 2. The Holy Catholic Church. 3. The Communion of Saints. 4. The Resurrection of the Body.—(Nicene) 5. That the Son is "Begotten, not made, being of one Substance with the Father." 6. That "by Him all things were made." 7. That the Holy Ghost "proceedeth from the Father and the Son." 8. That the Holy Ghost "spake by the prophets." 9. One Baptism for the remission of sins.—(Athanasian) 10. Judgment according to works. 11. The punishment of "those that have done evil in everlasting fire."

If this is to "hold the Faith unfeigned," then assuredly those depositaries of the Faith which "we have received," contain many unnecessary and omit many necessary things. And as we believe those creeds to contain the Truth as the apostles themselves taught it;—to be summaries of that gospel, of which one apostle has said, "If any man preach unto you any *other gospel*, let him be accursed;" and of which another apostle has said, "If there come any unto you, and *bring not this doctrine*, receive him not into your house, neither



bid him God speed; for he that biddeth him God speed, is partaker of his evil deeds;" we must be permitted to think that the correspondence before us has brought out conclusive evidence of the fact, that the Protestant bodies, which these Sociétés Evangéliques represent, have not the orthodoxy of belief indispensable, on scriptural grounds, to a true basis of unity. At the same time, the statement of facts prefixed to the correspondence furnishes to our apprehension decisive proof, that if tried by the other scriptural tests,—whether they do the will of God,—whether they hear His Church,—whether they adhere to the apostolical traditions, or cause division by departing from them,—they will, in all these respects, be found equally wanting.

With a view to make the position of the Sociétés Evangéliques in France understood, the Committee of the Foreign Aid Society have gone into some historical detail. They "inform us, that *the Reformed worship was reorganized by Napoleon in 1802, (18th of Germinal, an. x.)*"; and they explain the organic constitution which the professors of this "Reformed worship" then accepted from the hands of the revolutionary government. The progress of the community thus organized, from the date of "Bonaparte's establishment of Protestantism," to the present time, is then described; and it is said to consist, at this moment, of "ninety consistorial churches, with 404 pasteurs paid by the state; the number of Lutheran pasteurs in addition being 233."—We are next told with respect to the *faith* of these "churches," that they were originally "reorganized without a creed;" and that, in the course of time, "it was gradually discovered, that the great body of the salaried pasteurs were infected with the Neologism of Germany, and the infidelity of the age of Louis XV.;" that "*it was hardly possible to find twenty pasteurs who confessed the doctrine of the Trinity and the Atonement*;" that at the present moment, "*the established (that is, the State-paid) Protestantism of France is for the most part Socinianism*;" that there are in all only "an estimated number of 150 pasteurs, who faithfully preach Jesus Christ;" and that "the Lutheran pasteurs, with a few exceptions, are Neologists or Socinians."

We pause to suggest a few reflections upon this state of things. The Protestant communities thus described, whence came they? From what point did they set out upon the journey which has brought them to this end? They begun with the rejection of all ecclesiastical authority, except that which was devised by themselves, or administered in conformity with their judgment;—with the assertion of a principle of independence in matters of religion, and, at the same time, strong professions of what the Foreign Aid Society considers doctrinal orthodoxy—the Helvetic Confession, the Confession of Augsburg, and the rest. They are the spiritual descendants of those who, in the Preface to the Helvetic Confession, wrote as follows: "Attestamur omnibus consensum nostrum unanimum, quem dedit nobis Dominus, ut in nostris ecclesiis, quibus nos ministrare voluit Dominus, idem loquamur omnes, nec sint inter nos dissidia,

sed simus integrum corpus, eâdem mente eâdemque sententiâ." Of that consent we now see the result. After the lapse of 274 years, they are admitted by their fellow Protestants to have come from this beginning, to almost a general agreement in Socinianism and infidelity; while the Roman Catholics, against whose errors they began with protesting, in spite of those errors remain where they were, maintaining (as they ever have maintained) the Divinity and the Atonement of their Saviour, and adhering to every article of the Apostles', the Nicene, and the Athanasian Creeds.

This, then, is the state of things which the Sociétés Evangéliques have to deal with in France:—on the one hand, a branch of the Church founded by the Holy Ghost on the day of Pentecost, governed by bishops, priests, and deacons, deriving authority by visible succession from the apostles, and though infected in various points with superstition and error, holding every article of the Faith once delivered to the Saints, so far as it is expressed in the three Catholic Creeds; on the other hand, certain religious communities, founded by Napoleon on the "18th of Germinal, an. x.," governed by pasteurs elected by themselves, and approved by the "Ministre des Cultes" for the time being, and, for the most part, teaching Socinianism or infidelity. Under these circumstances, "several pasteurs, distinguished for their zeal and piety, and lamenting the fallen condition of the Reformed Churches as it regarded their doctrinal system, resolved to form a Society." With what object? the reader will inquire; and will doubtless expect the answer to be, to restore the doctrinal purity of the "Reformed Churches;" to convert the Socinians and infidels of the Napoleonistic persuasion. Nothing of the kind. The first object of this Society was, and is, to evangelize "the *Roman Catholic* population of France!"—to convert them, without asking the consent of their bishops, (for the Society "does not profess to promote an Episcopalian form of church government,") to the same profession of belief which, after the lapse of 274 years, is now everywhere bearing the fruit of Socinianism and Neology. They have also a second object; but even this is not to rescue the unhappy "Reformed" from their Socinian teachers. The respect which is not paid to the institution of Christ,\* is paid to that of Napoleon; and while the authority of bishops who confess their Saviour is set at nought, that of "pasteurs" who deny Him is recognised. The Society, in this part of its undertaking, proposes only "*to assist and cooperate with any of the pasteurs of the consistorial churches, who may desire to revive in their congregations,*

---

\* There are persons so ready to pervert every thing which is said in favour of Churches admitted to be infected with superstition and error, that we think it necessary to guard against misinterpretation. We do not, of course, mean that the government, doctrine, and ritual of the Church of France is to be respected as if it were in all points of Christ's institution; but only, that it is to be respected *so far as it is so*; and that the bishops, priests, and deacons of that Church, being legitimately descended from the Apostles, have a true authority, by Christ's institution.

or in the neighbouring districts, the doctrines of the Reformation." And while we are informed, shortly afterwards, that they are now employing sixty agents, at salaries amounting to 2,400*l.* per annum, in their attack upon the Church of France, we learn at the same time that they have not money enough to meet the demands made upon them for the restoration of the Faith among the Protestant heretics. "Last year," say the Foreign Aid Society, "the Committee was under the necessity of *refusing, for want of funds, the application of ninety pasteurs.*" They state also, that very few of those Protestants whom they recognise as orthodox, have in any way separated themselves from the heretical majority.

We leave our readers to judge from these facts, whether it is possible for the Church of England, upon any scriptural principle whatever, to connect herself with the Protestantism which these Societies represent. It is painful for us to think that any four English clergymen could be found, who not only did not see in such facts as these serious obstacles to unity, but who could deliberately put them forward as constituting in themselves *a true basis of union*. A more *unevangelical* basis of union it is certainly difficult to conceive; and the fact that it has been so put forward may perhaps have weight, along with other circumstances, in enabling us to judge of the pretensions of the religious school from which it has emanated. To us, the correspondence which we have been considering appears chiefly valuable, as illustrating two important lessons, which ought to be constantly borne in mind when proposals tending to unity are mooted in the present day. The first is, the very great tendency of religious communities, taught to rely upon private judgment as the foundation of their religion, to undervalue, and virtually abandon, the Catholic objective Faith, while they elevate into its place their own differential opinions; a tendency, of the degree of which they are, for the most part, themselves unconscious. The second is the extreme deficiency of vigilance and theological accuracy in our own prevailing habits of thought. Pious people in England are only too often disposed to accept, as satisfactory evidence of orthodoxy, the most vague and evasive statements, if redeemed by a slight plausibility in their general tone. Professions of belief, which would have been sufficient to convict their authors of heresy in the best ages of the Church, would in many cases require but a very little garnish of peculiar phraseology to give them a perfect odour of sanctity in the eyes of highly respectable people in this country. This consideration ought to make us doubly resolute in adhering to the old Catholic standards, as the indispensable tests of that soundness of Faith, without which any attempt at the reunion of professing Christians could tend only to the corruption of the pure, without purifying the corrupt portions of the nominally believing world.

1. *The Character of the Papacy. Preached for the Reformation Society, by the Rev. R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D. &c.* Nisbet, 1839.
2. *Some Answer to the Inquiry, Why are you become a Catholic? By R. W. SIBTHORP, B.D.* Dolman, 1842.
3. *A Further Answer to the Inquiry, &c. By the same.* Dolman, 1842.
4. *Why have you become a Romanist? By W. DODSWORTH, M.A.* Burns, 1842.
5. *Remarks on the Second Letter of the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp. By W. DODSWORTH, M.A.* Burns, 1842.
6. *Reasons wherefore a Clergyman of the Church of England should not become a Roman Catholic. By HENRY DRUMMOND, Esq.* Hatchard, 1842.
7. *An Examination of the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp's Reasons for Secession. By the Rev. W. PALMER.* Rivingtons, 1842.
8. *A Letter to the Archbishop of Canterbury on some Circumstances connected with the present Crisis. By the Rev. E. B. PUSEY, D.D.* Rivingtons, 1842.

SOMEWHAT less than twelve years ago, a demagogue stood up in a certain popular assembly, and expressed his deep pity for the unhappy young men who still continued to enter into holy orders in the Church of England. "I had hoped," he said, "that these foolish ordinations would terminate. But these young gentlemen must bear in mind, that, though the nation will feel itself bound to make provision for such as in past years have entered into orders; though it would doubtless be unjust that a corporation like the Church, which was set up by parliament nearly three hundred years ago, and is older therefore than either the East or West India Company, should be abolished, without adequate compensation to those who have wasted their youth in its service, yet by them who enter this body now that it is condemned by the country,—when its charter is on the eve of being cancelled by the authority which gave it,—when it is admitted on all hands to be not useless only, but absolutely detrimental,—neither indulgence nor compensation can fairly be expected. They choose to invest their time and property in a condemned building, and can expect no more pity than the man who bought the Borough of Gatton after the publication of schedule A, or a West India estate after Mr. Buxton's motion."

We do not exactly remember which of the

"Spectres wan, and birds of boding cry,"

who flitted about in the tempest of the Reform Bill, the Clergy have to thank for this declaration, though we rather believe it proceeded from the sapient Joseph Hume, a personage whom our readers will

perhaps hardly remember, for beings of this sort are forgotten so soon as they sink into their original insignificance. Nor would his words be entitled to longer remembrance than himself, had they not been symptomatic of what for a few moments was the predominant feeling of the British nation. How strong this feeling—how widespread the apprehension—is best shown by the disposition evinced by many of the elder Clergy to make such an alteration in our Church system as might adapt it to the new state of the national mind. We have before us the minutes of a meeting at which a large body of country Clergy in one of the northern districts attended. Besides various changes in the Liturgy,—the adaptation of the baptismal and burial services to the dissenting taste,—we find a grave proposal for disencumbering the Canons of what “may give just occasion of offence;” which is explained to mean those expressions by which “the dissenters complain that they are excommunicated.”

What a state of feeling does all this reveal to us! The legislature and people complain that the Church does not answer their expectations; that the national wealth is idly lavished for its support; that various sects have arisen, who are displeased at its exclusive possession of property and power; that its elders must set their houses in order, its youth turn elsewhere for support. And this cry is met on the part of the Clergy by a profession of their willingness to be reduced to the condition of a sect; to abandon those declarations by which our forefathers asserted their belief that the Church was emphatically God’s household in this nation,—that baptism received men not merely into an earthly corporation, but into immediate union with the Son of God,—that the very bodies of those who died in the Church’s communion were

“The images of God in earthly clay,”—

that children must be instructed respecting the real presence of that Holy Ghost, whereof every child of the Church must be taught to declare, that he “sanctifieth *me*, and all the elect people of God.” To abandon those Canons by which “dissenters complain that they are excommunicated,” would in fact be to abandon the Church’s title. For is Christ divided? Can He have various rival bodies in our land? Is not the Church His body? And therefore, unless those who wilfully separate themselves from our communion are separating themselves also from the communion of Christ, with what show of reason can we call ourselves *the Church of England*?

When such were the dangers from within and without,—such the readiness of our friends to renounce our very name and privileges,—such the internecine war denounced by our opponents,—it was natural that the minds of those who were just entering upon our Church’s service should be distracted by various emotions. Many who had been brought up to regard the service of the sanctuary as an honourable and useful occupation, when they heard Mr. Hume’s

denunciations on the one side, and the admissions of their elder brethren on the other, began to doubt whether they should not devote the years which lay before them to some more promising pursuit. They had been taught, that to minister as the priests of God's service was no degradation even for the greatest families of the earth. But to act as the self-constituted teachers of a sectarian society was a far different employment. This they saw, from their observation of the majority of dissenting teachers, was an office neither beneficial nor ennobling. And however earnest their zeal for the conversion of their brethren, why subject themselves to so useless and vexatious a yoke as was imposed on the Clergy of the Church of England? If the Clergy are only the teachers of one out of various sects, why need they renounce those employments by which other lecturers can employ their leisure and augment their resources? The Rev. Mr. Brotherton lectures in his factory chapel on the Lord's-day, and on the other days of the week in the chapel of St. Stephen's. The pious shoemaker preaches on the Lord's-day to those for whom, during the week, he makes soles and upper-leathers. Why should the Clergy of the Church of England, if they too are but the teachers of a sect, be debarred the profit of the one, or the honours of the other?

We speak from memory as well as observation, when we assert these to have been the thoughts of young men, who twelve years ago were selecting their employment. Thus circumstanced, they looked into the formularies and laws of the English Church, to see whether it was true, as popular belief declared, that the Church was a sectarian corporation, established in the earlier part of the sixteenth century, by King Henry the Eighth and Archbishop Cranmer. Great was their surprise at the result of their inquiries. If they looked at the Church's laws, they found them running back into a far earlier period: they found that Bishop Gibson referred for his authority, not to recent acts of parliament, but to the decrees of councils, which met even in Saxon times. If they looked again at the Liturgy, they found, that, far from being the creation of the Reformers, it was merely a purified exhibition of the worship of primitive times. The early fathers, again, they found set forth by the Church as her standard for the interpretation of disputed passages of Holy Writ,—the first four general councils as her rule for the trial of heresy. Moreover, the authority of her ministers was referred by all her leading divines to a succession derived from the very hands of the apostles.

That these truths have taken hold on the judgment and feelings of the mass of our younger Clergy,—that they have begun, in consequence, to maintain that position from understanding and principle which a few years back was only occupied by prescription and through prejudice,—this is manifest in every part of the land. Everywhere we have young men arising, who declare their willingness to make any sacrifice for the Church of England, so long as she preserves her claim to be the original Church Catholic of this land. The recent willingness on the part of their elder brethren to give up whatever



was distinctive in the Church system, is put to shame and forgotten. We can hardly realize the fact that, not ten years ago, it was seriously canvassed whether we should not throw overboard those distinctive portions of our Liturgy and Formularies which are now acknowledged to give our Church the only claim to the confidence of the country.

The revived foliage of spring will ever follow in this manner from winter's tempests, when the tree is sound at heart, and its roots enter into a soil which fears not disturbance. And when men express their surprise at the rapidity of the reaction, and wonder that new views and principles, new subjects of attack, new names and parties, should in so short a period have occupied the field,—we can only declare our conviction, that it is a proof of the vigour of the plant, and of the soundness of the basis which supports it. But we must notice one of the peculiar forms in which this revived energy has exhibited itself.

The universities could not be expected to escape that excitement which agitated the whole land. At Cambridge, its most marked effect was of a political kind: the Whig members lost their seats, and Tory sentiments became, for the first time, popular in the Debating Society. A religious movement followed; but not of so immediate and striking a kind as in the sister university. It was at Oxford, where Wicliffe had first hoisted the flag of Anglican independence,—where the preposterous excesses of Henry VIII. on the one side, and of James II. on the other, had found their staunchest opponents,—where Wesley had imbibed that spirit which led to an ill-directed but deep-hearted outbreak of zeal in a day of general indifference; it was here that was found the rallying point in this time of danger. The university contained at that time more than its usual number of men detached from the ordinary employments of college life, and able to direct their attention to public interests. Engaged hitherto in moral and metaphysical speculations, they were suddenly recalled from their dreams of science by the threatened downfall of the institutions which they loved. While the heads of the university were satisfied by witnessing the warm-hearted zeal with which Tory sentiments were responded to in the theatre at the Duke of Wellington's installation, these men were pushing their inquiries into the various questions which the overthrow of any existing safeguard made it essential to agitate. They did not, like the mass of the country Clergy, content themselves with realizing their situation as members of Christ's Catholic Church in England; as might be expected perhaps from academics, they took a more general ground, and reverted to more original principles. And this appears to us to be the secret of that divergency which has, in a measure, dissociated the Oxford Tracts—for, of course, we are speaking of their learned authors—from the general mind of the Church of England.

We apprehend that with the earlier numbers of that series the great mass of the Clergy fully agreed. They were glad to find men bold enough to advance opinions which they themselves had always

implicitly received, and able enough to vindicate them against their common adversaries. They witnessed with pleasure the total and irretrievable overthrow of the dissenting party in our Church—an overthrow the more remarkable from the surprise and imbecility of the vanquished. In the very moment when they were calling upon the Church to abandon her established principles; to give up her baptismal formularies, because, after accepting them with the most solemn oaths, they were themselves unable to believe them; to admit that she was no longer Christ's mystical body, because dissenters did not like to be reminded that they ought to be His living members; at this very moment arose a company of men, strong in knowledge, faith, and self-denial, who proved, in a manner which could not be questioned, that these truths, instead of being abandoned, needed only to be acted upon; that what we needed was not a new reformation, but to return to the old one; that, if the Church called herself Christ's mystic bride, it was because she was so in truth; and that never could she fulfil her high mission till all the great truths which her Prayer-book contained were exemplified in the lives of her children.

If the writers of the Oxford Tracts had persevered in this course, they would, in the full concurrence of the great body of the Clergy, in a hearty assimilation to the ancient divines of the Church of England, have found support enough against any memorials from the Wesleyans of Birmingham, or the lay-elders of Cheltenham. But in the circumstances of the case this could hardly be expected. The leading minds among these writers had not had the advantage of being trained themselves in the Anglo-Catholic school; they had to grope for their principles, as men suddenly beset by nightly robbers catch at such weapons as the moment allows, while the darkness was as yet broken only by such uncertain glimpses of light as were supplied by the Pietistic or Neological parties with which they were severally connected. Their sentiments, therefore, had not been worked out by a previous development of the English system, but were taken up by persons who came rather as allies than as subjects to the defence of the Church. The just deference which they have shown to the great divines of the seventeenth century was more than, under the circumstances, could be expected from them. And hence arises what appears to us their great defect, as it has been the main detraction from their influence—an indisposition to do justice to our English Reformation.

Were the English Reformation to be viewed as a mere insulated fact, abstracted from the state of circumstances which preceded it, it were a fact as difficult to account for as to defend. That men should be content to be dissociated from a vast body of their fellow-Christians; that the rulers of a Church originally greatly indebted to the Church of Rome should make a pride of protesting that they owe it no subjection; that they should be satisfied to be hemmed in by the precincts of this narrow island, unprofitably by the prayers of Christ's universal flock, uninterested by its advance, unmoved by its

reverses;—all this must seem utterly inexplicable, unless seen in constant juxtaposition with the unjust oppression, the superstition, and impurity of the papacy. Now, the Tracts, though they recognise, yet they can hardly be said to do justice to this truth. When their writers, indeed, have occasion to oppose any popish error, they do so with a force both of learning and logic which renders them, as Mr. Sibthorp confesses, the most successful assailants of Romanism, in this age of theological inquiries. But it is manifest that, while the miseries consequent on the loss of unity throughout the Christian world are continually before them, the countervailing thought of those fearful enormities which were its cause, is a less habitual subject of their cogitations.

This was not an unnatural state of things for men who approached this subject on the side rather of speculation than of action,—not amidst the bustle of life, but in the groves of the academy. But it gives ground for the apprehension, which the Bishop of Oxford some time since expressed, lest a dangerous error, from which the writers themselves, we confidently believe, are free, should display itself among their followers. They should remember for whom they write. They should reflect that the great mass of men have been brought up in the absurd and unphilosophical opinion that out of the mine of Scripture truth they are to shape a set of opinions for themselves, without profiting by the labours or experience of their predecessors. If the great truth of the Church's unity be brought prominently before such persons, while its necessary counterpoise is forgotten, such partial development of truth will be almost as injurious as the maintenance of error. We should feel no surprise, therefore, if some disciples of the Oxford school should fall into schism, as so many clergymen of the Low-Church party have done within our recollection. But it is a curious proof, how much less High Churchmen are in danger of popery than their opponents of dissent, that, while little sensation was occasioned when the Rev. Messrs. Bulteel, Brenton, Philpot, and many others, became separatists, so much importance should be attached to the perversion even of a young layman, by the papists. But as though to show more clearly where the danger of popery really lies, from what quarter its enemies are truly to be expected, we are presented, at this critical moment, with a flagrant case of delinquency, in the instance of a person recently secretary to the Religious Tract Society.

We confess that this appears to us to be a circumstance well worthy of observation. We have long thought, in contradiction to the opinion of many with whom in other points we agreed, that popery was likely to increase. We never quarrelled with *Frazer's Magazine* for making its stand for *no popery*. We think that for many years every thing was done to favour its advance. For if any truth be clearly written in Holy Scripture, and plainly imprinted upon the history of the Church,—if any thing shines forth more than another in ancient type or primeval prophecy,—it is surely the sacred unity of

the Church. Christ's body is one. It was His sublime prayer at that eventful season when He concluded the most heart-thrilling exhortations which were ever given to the sons of men, that His disciples might be one, "as Thou, Father, art in Me and I in Thee, that they may be one in Us, that the world may believe that Thou hast sent Me." And the saying of the departed Saviour found a response in the devotion of generations of men; it spoke in the zeal of missionaries and the agony of martyrs, in the concord which assuaged the hatred of warring nations, in the harmonious institutions which bound together the most distant countries and reduced to order the tangled maze of the history of mankind. Now, it may not be that a truth thus graven in heaven above and earth beneath can for ever be forgotten. The pages of Holy Writ will not always exhibit it in vain. We have ever felt, therefore, that, so soon as men were led to the discovery of this great principle, there would be much risk that ill-informed minds should seek for its realization, however unjustly, in the papacy. The time was, when England presented no such danger; when our national Church stood forth, uniting the whole mind of a great people, who, having received from their forefathers the blessed inheritance of an identity with the one holy society of ancient days, gave promise to hand it on, without diminution or division, to the latest generations. But this blessed prospect has been marred by the growth of dissent. The pillar of western catholicity, "founded on a rock, though standing amidst the sea," no longer presents that fair and united front which can defy the storm. It still indeed abides, but the wreck and sea-weed which defile it make men doubt whether they shall find as firm hold as once for their footsteps,

"Ut pelagi rupes, magno veniente fragore,  
 Quæ sese, multis circum latrantibus undis,  
 Mole tenet : scopuli nequicquam et spumea circum  
 Saxa fremunt, laterique illisa refunditur alga."

Our firm conviction is, that the prevalence of dissent is the certain preparation for popery, and the multitude of divisions the death of the reformed faith.

Here, however, we are met by a contrary system. Unity, it is said, means merely kindness : to agree to unite, means to agree to differ. Let all parties, therefore, but profess themselves satisfied, let them abstain from mutual crimination, let them join in such laudable objects as they can pursue together, and the real end is attained. Charity, not communion, is the unity of the Church.

This principle we need not say is that of the Bible Society ; and in the Religious Tract Society it has been still more completely embodied. We hardly know any thing more exact than the manner in which the Religious Tract Society illustrates the great theological error of the day. We refer to the tendency to speak of truth and falsehood, not as having an inherent existence, but only as they are embodied in our own opinions. Men do not feel them to be realities

independent of themselves, but regard them only as developed in their own conceptions. Of old, *the faith* meant the eternal realities which were revealed from heaven; now it is supposed to consist only in the acquiescence of man's mind. For an external rule of truth is substituted a mere inward adherence.

Now, to this tendency the Society in question is exactly conformed. It propagates those opinions only, which are held to be essential by orthodox Christians of all parties. The rule by which the importance of opinions is determined is the private feeling of those gentlemen who make up the committee. When the Council of Nice declared what it supposed to be the essential articles of the faith, it rested itself upon the constant belief of the Church in a certain body of external verities. It held "fast the tradition received" from the apostles. It declared those things fundamental which the one body of the faithful had so believed. And therefore did ancient opinion maintain one uniform direction, because guided by the sun and moon which shone in the Church's firmament, so that the change of place and time made no differences in its laws. Not so the time-pieces which, according to the fancy or feeling of individuals, may be altered every hour. The Tract Society's rule of fundamentals varies every year, according as new names are drafted into the committee, or new influences direct its former members. Its late secretary observes with perfect truth, "No two denominations agree in fundamental truths. They would not give you the same list of them. I doubt whether two ministers of any one of these bodies are prepared to say they entirely agree as to what these fundamental truths are, or how many the term comprehends."—*Sibthorp's First Letter*, p. 28.

The person, then, who was to be secretary to an institution in which all the worst features of the time were to be thus fully embodied, must needs have been infected in all its malignity with the epidemic of the day. Of Mr. Sibthorp's preparatory training, we have the following account in a very able letter of Mr. Dodsworth's:—

"You were ordained, I believe, as curate to the Rev. John Scott, of Hull, the son of the Calvinistic commentator of the Bible, who inherited, along with his father's piety, the peculiar doctrines of his school. I remember you at that time an ardent, devoted minister, zealously preaching (so-called) Low Church doctrines, a great favourite with dissenters, and an eloquent speaker at Bible societies, &c. Your associations, therefore, were peculiarly *ultra-Protestant*, and I think that you will not deny that the opinions you generally entertained then were as different from those of the Church of England, as represented in her doctors of highest repute, *e. g.* Hammond, Andrews, Hooker, &c., as are the opinions which you now hold. I should say, far more different. Your opinions varied in no essential point from those of dissenters,—Independents, Wesleyans, Baptists, &c., with whom you associated as brethren, and with whom you joined in religious societies, and, if my memory does not deceive me, I think even in social prayer-meetings.

"In a later period of your Protestant life, you became the colleague of Mr. Baptist Noel in the ministry of St. John's Chapel, Bedford Row, whose opinions on "unity" have been put forth in a tract which attempts to show that it consists in a sort of spiritual union of all sects and denominations. As you preached in the evening from the same pulpit which he occupied in

the morning, it may be concluded that your views were essentially the same with his. You will scarcely object, therefore, to the inference, that at this time, I believe about nine or ten years ago, you were an extreme Protestant, practically and essentially identified with dissenters in your doctrines and opinions. If any corroboration of these statements were needed, it might be found in the circumstance, that at one time, and, if my recollection does not fail me, at a time *subsequent* to that above named, you were secretary to the 'Religious Tract Society,' a society formed on the express principle, or rather *no principle*, of a community of all sects and denominations holding some fundamental doctrines."—*Dodsworth's First Letter*, p. 8.

With these feelings, then, and this education did Mr. Sibthorp take his place among the leading divines of the Low Church party. His talents gave him an ascendancy which his gentility and generosity increased. Above all, the ardent piety, which evidently shone through his whole character, won for him respect. He took his part in life when those expectations which good men deduced from the religious societies in which he cooperated were in their bloom. The general extension of Christ's kingdom,—the reign of love, peace, purity, and truth,—all that the impassioned students of prophecy brought forth from the ancient stores of revelation,—was anticipated as that which the active spirits of the day were to realize by their exertions. Mr. Sibthorp preached, like others, about "the endeavours now making to extend throughout the British Islands the doctrines and principles which, under the distinctive name of Protestantism, constitute, in fact, the Christianity of the holy Scriptures." (Sibthorp on the Character of the Papacy, p. 28.) Mr. Dodsworth's assertion respecting his disposition to unite with dissenters even in their public worship, would seem to be borne out by the feeling which he himself expresses in his second letter, that on his former principles such union ought to be admitted. If episcopal government be merely, as his friends supposed, an accidental incumbrance of our Church system,—if all other sincere men are equally members of Christ's body with the Church Catholic to which we belong,—to separate men from our communion in consequence of a mere outward formality is indeed a most culpable violation of the great rule of christian love. We do not wonder that dissenting teachers feel that bitterness, which, when occasion arrives, they show with sufficient clearness, at the pedantic stiffness of what they call their *dear evangelical brethren*. Why separate from their society men who agree in fundamentals with themselves? Why exchange a stately bow on the platform, to be followed by a total estrangement in the intercourse of life? There is an unfairness about this from which any observant spectator would gather, that there was only a hollow union. What else could be expected when Clergymen who were most ready at the meeting to hail the presence of their dissenting brethren, were most ready also to make game of them round the dinner table? So it proved. When the dissenters had gained their end, had obtained an unwonted influence and notoriety, had induced a large portion of the Clergy to allow themselves to be regarded by their people as only the teachers



of one sect of Christians,—they then threw off the mask, and showed in their Ecclesiastical Knowledge Society at what it was that they were truly aiming. From that time those who give them credence have no right to complain. *Prudens emisti.* Mr. Sibthorp, at all events, escaped from the snare; happy had he known how to use his liberty! His was too christian a temper to be satisfied with a base compromise, in which the mask of interest should shield the reality of hatred. He did not wait till the corn-law meetings professed that, since religious subjects are so uncertain, they must take refuge in that unity which politics supplied—till they threw overboard the Lord's Prayer, and made their confession of faith out of the Corn-Law Rhymes of Ebenezer Elliot. That this was the secret of his progress he has expressly declared:—

"Could the one body of Christ," he asks, "consist of a mixture of Prussian Lutherans, French Calvinists, and Swiss Socinians; of Independents, Baptists, Quakers, Shakers, and Irvingites, and Plymouth Brethren; of Methodists of the Old and of the New Connexion; of New Jerusalem-ites, and Primitive Revivalists? Could such discords be the designed fulfilment of a type of such holy order?"—*Sibthorp's First Letter*, p. 12.

Such then were Mr. Sibthorp's expectations, and thus were they disappointed. Now, just when he was under the impulse of such feelings, he came across that other movement, which, in the earlier part of this article, we have slightly delineated. His individual dissatisfaction and disappointment were met by the full tide of public feeling, which was carrying the mass of the Clergy towards the great truths of Catholic union, and of the real and substantive existence of the external Church. Couple with all this the present activity of our Romist separatists, the renewed energy which causes of a public nature have excited among continental Catholics, and it is impossible not to feel how great was the danger.

His old principles, as secretary of the Tract Society, were so far from being a safeguard in this new state of things, that they were the real cause of his danger. We have shown that his aspirations after unity had been called forth only to be blighted by the mortifying conviction that such unity as he had anticipated was hopeless among reformed Christians. On what should he fall back? On the demonstrative certainty of that interpretation of Scripture in which he had been instructed. The Church of England, indeed, appeals to so fixed a rule on this subject, that its controversy with the Romanists, though requiring labour and research, yet admits of final adjudication. Mr. Sibthorp appears to have a suspicion of the impossibility of making good his ground on her principles, when he says, "it was not to be expected that in the second and third centuries there would be found, even if there had been fuller documents, that clear perception of the designed succession to St. Peter, which the ninth and tenth centuries present." (*Sibthorp's First Letter*, p. 19.) Now, it is evident that, if the writers of the early Church are referred to as witnesses, not as legislators,—if the object be to learn, not what

they decreed, but what was delivered to them,—it is precisely to those who are nearest to the fountain that our appeal must be addressed. And we say confidently, that, though Rome was respected as capital of the civil world, and as a signal seat of religious instruction, yet that no vestige can be found in the primitive age of her having possessed an ecclesiastical empire even over the Churches of the West. Her influence was beginning to grow into authority in the days of Leo : Gregory the Great expressed himself, even towards those who were beyond the suburbicarian district, in a manner which persons alive to the usurpations of Rome would rightly suspect ; but neither of these prelates spoke of themselves as masters beyond their own patriarchate. Priority, not supremacy, was their claim. And at an earlier period still, even this concession was not demanded ; all bishops were as yet equal, and the Roman pontiff had but the advantage of presiding over a wealthier Church. These subjects are well treated by Mr. Sibthorp's various opponents, all of whom take that catholic ground on which only popery can be defeated. Dr. Biber we believe to be a learned German, of great sincerity and singleness of mind, who has taken refuge in our Church, like the excellent Grabe, from dissatisfaction at the want of union among foreign protestants. Mr. Henry Drummond we suspect to have been led to the line which we are glad to see him adopt, by the habit of contemplating the Church under that aspect under which prophecy presents it. The prophetic writings so clearly treat the Church as a visible substantive body, that no one who is imbued with this spirit can be satisfied with the low notions of the present day. With Mr. Drummond's forcible pamphlet we must join the two letters of Mr. Dodsworth, Incumbent of Christ Church, St. Pancras. Mr. Dodsworth writes like a person who is familiar with the errors through which Mr. Sibthorp has made shipwreck, but who has learnt the proper method of avoiding them. His earnestness leads him to inflict a few blows which we clearly see that he is unwilling to deal forth, and by which we suspect that Mr. Sibthorp has been more affected than by the valuable, though somewhat technical, pamphlet of the learned Mr. Palmer.

It is only while we here hold the pen that another pamphlet, of larger dimensions, has reached us ; in which Dr. Pusey undertakes to show that it is not to his writings, or those of his friends, that Mr. Sibthorp's defection, or that of any one else, is to be attributed. And this, with the qualification before made, we are quite willing to allow. We wish that our limits enabled us to enter more fully upon Dr. Pusey's letter, which, like whatever he writes, is worthy of attentive consideration. It is eloquent and earnest, yet calm and temperate ; and cannot fail, we think, to make a great impression upon those to whom it is more immediately addressed. We are glad to see his explanations on some points on which explanation was especially needed—his own statements on sin after baptism, which he greatly modifies—and the unhappy inadvertence of speaking of *reserve*, where it was designed only to enforce *reverence*. But we can only find time for a

very remarkable quotation—the prediction, namely, of an highly esteemed divine of the last age, which seems to be exactly fulfilled in our present situation. The following are said to have been the words which the Rev. T. Sikes, well known as the author of several very valuable publications, addressed to a friend shortly before his death :—

“ I seem to think I can tell you something, which you who are young may probably live to see, but which I, who shall soon be called away off the stage, shall not. Wherever I go all about the country, I see amongst the Clergy a number of very amiable and estimable men, many of them much in earnest, and wishing to do good. But I have observed one universal want in their teaching—the uniform suppression of one great truth : there is no account given any where, so far as I see, of the one Holy Catholic Church. I think that the causes of this suppression have been mainly two. The Church has been kept out of sight, partly in consequence of the civil establishment of the branch of it which is in this country, and partly out of false charity to dissent. Now, this great truth is an article of the creed; and if so, to teach the rest of the creed to its exclusion must be to destroy ‘ the analogy or proportion of the faith.’ This cannot be done without the most serious consequences. The doctrine is of the last importance; and the principles it involves of immense power; and some day, not far distant, it will judiciously have its reprisals. And whereas the other articles of the creed seem now to have thrown it into the shade, it will seem, when it is brought forward, to swallow up the rest. We now hear not a breath about the Church; by and by, those who live to see it, will hear of nothing else; and, just in proportion perhaps to its present suppression, will be its future development. Our confusion now-a-days is chiefly owing to the want of it; and there will be more confusion attending its revival. The effects of it I even dread to contemplate, especially if it come suddenly. And woe betide those, whoever they are, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring it forward. It ought, especially of all others, to be matter of catechetical teaching and training. The doctrine of the Church Catholic, and the privileges of Church-membership, cannot be explained from pulpits, and those who will have to explain it will hardly know where they are to turn themselves. They will be endlessly misunderstood and misinterpreted. There will be one great outcry of popery, from one end of the country to the other. It will be thrust upon minds unprepared, and on an uncatechized Church. Some will take it up and admire it as a beautiful picture; others will be frightened, and run away and reject it; and all will want a guidance which one hardly knows where they shall find. How the doctrine may be first thrown forward we know not; but the powers of the world may one day turn their backs upon us, and this will probably lead to those effects I have described.”—*Pusey's Letter*, p. 34.

It is difficult to conceive any words more exactly descriptive of what has happened; we would that they might teach a lesson of patience on the one side, and of forbearance on the other.

On the forbearance to which the abettors of High Church opinions are entitled, it is difficult to touch, because they have not always been treated as might be expected by those whose situation should make them value justice above every other virtue. Nothing can be more just, indeed, than that rulers should condemn what is injurious. But it is not just to condemn those who err on one side, and wink at those who err on the other. How many persons openly spurn at so plain a doctrine of the Church as baptismal regeneration! How many

scoff at the episcopal office and authority ! Yet these are left almost entirely without censure. Though such heresies are known to exist at the present day, few bishops are careful to reject their abettors from holy orders. Is it fair, then, that those who verge towards the other extreme should be subjected exclusively to the rigour of the law because their principles induce them to suffer without complaint ?\*

And yet, if there be one thing more than another which induces impartial spectators to look favourably on the persons of whom we speak, it is that they have borne with exemplary patience what might not unnaturally have been the ground of angry expostulation. We speak not of their conduct towards the majority of their opponents. The virulence and falsehood with which they have been assailed by a great portion of the daily press, especially by that which emanates from dissenting or semi-dissenting parties, it has not been difficult for them to endure. After men have been the victims of a certain amount of calumny, they care little for its repetition. But it must be matter of great patience to have been attacked by several persons of considerable note, who united such harshness of expression with such a perfect ignorance of what they censured. Not that all that has been said of them has been of this kind : they have had fairer opponents, and in writings so various there must needs be much which might be justly questioned. But, assuredly, Mr. Sikes's words have been amply fulfilled—"Woe betide those, who shall, in the course of Providence, have to bring these things forward."

We write while men's passions are at the height, and while it is impossible to predict what shall be the issue. But we have a strong conviction, that, if these writers do not by any false step undo the good which they have achieved,—that, if they gradually qualify the evil which has been its perhaps inseparable concomitant,—that, if they will but pursue the road of submission, meekness, order, and faith, which, notwithstanding all the obloquy poured upon them, they cannot be denied to have walked in,—they will be admitted hereafter to have been in their measure, and like other fallible men, a great and lasting benefit to the Church. It was but a few years back, that, when the celebrated Möhler was nominated to a professorship of divinity at Bonn, his appointment was prevented by the Archbishop of Cologne, in consequence of his admirable work on the Unity of the Church. That which, with certain necessary qualifications, would now pass current among ourselves, was then strange doctrine even to Westphalian ears. A few years, and what a change has come over men's spirits ! Time, the great teacher, has had its effect in that country ; it will have its effect among ourselves.

---

\* This subject is well handled in an excellent "Letter to the Bishop of Lincoln," &c., (Rivingtons, 1842,) which has just fallen into our hands.

1. *A Selection of Hymns.* London : Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge. 1841.
2. *The Child's Christian Year: Hymns for every Sunday and Holy-day, compiled for the use of Parochial Schools.* Oxford : Parker. London : Rivingtons. 1841.
3. *Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer, our Duty towards God, and Scripture History.* Derby : Mozley & Sons. London : Rivingtons. 1839.
4. *Hymns for Childhood.* By FELICIA HEMANS. Dublin : Curry, jun. & Co. Edinburgh : Fraser & Co. 1839.

OF all tasks which combine dignity with pleasure, and importance with cheering encouragement, there is none surely that can be compared to that of awakening in young people the perception and the enjoyment of poetry. It is the only branch of education in which three quarters of the work is done for us already. Yet, though it be at once the easiest and the most delightful of the teacher's duties, it has been, perhaps, the most neglected of all. To many, we have no doubt, the undertaking seems visionary and impracticable. Such will admit that it may be good, in an intellectual point of view, to make a child learn verses by heart, and right, in a moral and religious one, that he should be able to repeat hymns; but to expect from him sympathy or pleasure in poetry as such, is, in their creed, to expect an impossibility. Hence, perhaps, it is that so little attention has been paid to the quality of the verses contained in the elocution and hymn books from which young people are to learn. Till very lately they were all but made up of the very refuse of the English language. What wonder, then, that children should have confirmed the theory which held poetical enjoyment to be impossible at their age? If such were to be their associations with verse,—if, in addition to the natural ingredient of bitterness which there must needs be more or less in *one's lessons*, all that was presented to them in the form of verse was such as no taste could digest,—what wonder that they made wry faces at such *Squeers'* diet? Boys, indeed, have all along had some chance with the classics,—though even they have too often received no great encouragement to associate them with enjoyment, or to connect them in any way with the spontaneous working of their imaginations; but girls have, for the most part, been in a sad predicament as regards poetry. The subject is one on which their teachers have known no more than themselves, with the additional disadvantage of tastes already perverted. All reading of poetry, at their age, beyond what may be contained in the aforesaid elocution and hymn books, has been probably denounced as “filling their heads with nonsense”—the sacred springs of romance have thus been choked at their natural outlets, and left to ooze and disperse themselves in unwholesome swamps.

And yet surely there never was a greater error than this. What condition of being is more susceptible of poetry than that of children? It is better in this respect than that of youth. For in

youth, the senses with one sex—false standards of taste and action with the other—sickly feeling with both—disturb the perception and hinder the enjoyment of poetry as such. There may be much impetuous delight in Byron, much languishing over *Lalla Rookh*, where there is but little relish for actual poetry. But in the case of children, the imagination is lively, without being under the dominion of the senses; it knows not, and would disdain if it knew, the particular fashions which may be dominant,—it is guiltless of all unreality,—it delights in the beauty that is around it. The ear is susceptible of pleasurable impressions, even from infancy. First music and then metre obviously catch and arrest the attention. Such are the results of observation; the facts of the case; and how should they be otherwise? Is not the enjoyment of poetry essentially child-like? Do we not clothe ourselves, intellectually at least, with something of the mind of little children, when we read *Shakespeare* or *Spenser*? And if so, must not those in whom this mind is habitual, be even more highly susceptible of poetical influence than ourselves? We do not of course mean that their thoughts can embrace the same range, that they can have the same delight in meditation, or in severe and difficult reflection, that advancing years bring to those who cherish intellectual pursuits. But within their natural range, we say, they have a capacity for enjoying poetry in a way purer and more perfect than ours. Nor is that range so very limited;—their sense of harmony is ordinarily fine; their imagination lively, and fond of the vast, the mysterious, the terrible. Romance is but too easy to those who have had no experience of this dull working-day world. All beyond the precincts of the nursery and the school-room is clothed to their eyes in holiday attire. And be it remembered that the recurring appearances of nature are not the familiar unmarked things to them that they are to us. They return after what in their calendar are long intervals, and so have all the freshness of novelty. This makes imagery striking to them, which to us would be common-place.

It may, however, be objected to all that we have been saying, that, instead of encouraging us to present children with poetry, it rather encourages us to let them do without it, inasmuch as it appears that their imaginations require no stimulant, and are sure to exercise themselves if left alone. But, unless it can be proved that they are sure to exercise themselves in a right and healthy way, the objection must go for nothing. We maintain that, like every other power, and more than any other power, the imagination must be educated and directed from the very first. It will work, no doubt, in any case; but its workings, if left to themselves, may, and will be, irregular, frightful, and disastrous.

A second objection may perhaps come more readily to hand than that with which we have now dealt. There is no good poetry, it will be said, which they can understand. From whatever quarter this objection may come, it will never be from children themselves. They



are quite satisfied to admire without understanding. An object is none the less attractive in their eyes for being half-shrouded in mystery. How often do we observe some particular phrase or passage catch their fancy, of the meaning of which they can give no explanation! An eminent poet and first-rate critic of the present day has gone farther than this, has extended the principle to adults, and laid it down that, "in order to enjoy good poetry, it is not at all necessary to understand it." We are not sure whether it is not in the same passage that he instances—

"The sun to me is dark  
And silent as the moon  
When she deserts the night  
Hid in her vacant interlunar cave."

We honestly confess ourselves to be in the same predicament with this distinguished person. What the moon's vacant interlunar cave in which she hides herself may be we do not venture positively to pronounce; but, notwithstanding, we admire the passage exceedingly. The same divine poet charms both our ear and our soul with a line on which, however, we should be sorry to undergo an examination:—

"Or hear'st thou rather, pure ethereal stream?"

To pass to more sacred poetry, we delighted in the war-horse of the Book of Job; and more particularly in these words, "Hast thou given the horse strength? hast thou clothed his neck with thunder?" before we had encountered any of the explanations of the latter clause which have been offered; nor do we much trouble ourselves with them now when we are regaling ourselves with that sublime passage. In truth, it is not so much a meaning in actual, as in possible possession that we demand. We cannot enjoy what we know to be sheer nonsense: man and boy turn away alike from that. But if harmonious numbers indicate some deep thought, we are willing to enjoy them in the faith of a meaning being there, though we have seen but glimpses of it—nay, to enjoy them all the more on that account.

If, therefore, there be no valid objection to addressing the minds of children with poetry, let us study to do so, for there is all imaginable argument in its favour. Poetry is the safest, as it is the highest exercise of the imagination. The terrors to which that power so naturally does homage are shorn of their direst and most baleful aspects, when they are brought within the realm of beauty. Thoughts of awe will not so readily act as "night fears," when once they have moved "harmonious numbers." And to enjoy poetry at all, is always an exercise, however unconscious, of the intellect; so that by giving the imagination this its best and noblest outlet, we are making it help to strengthen, instead of, as it otherwise might, enfeeble the mind. Last of all, it is through poetry that religious truth most readily finds its way to the heart of "children and child-like souls;" this divine influence it is which enables us to sympathize with holy men of old. Sacred poetry is, after of course her creed, sacraments, liturgy, and

ministry, the brightest possession of the Church—the richest pasturage of her children; eminently fitted, therefore, for her little ones, who, as yet, require none of her stern discipline; whose minds are all open to its gentle and holy inspirations; ready for truth when so presented to them as that they can livingly apprehend it, but incapable of giving it any cordial reception in the forms of logic, or the loveless antagonism of controversy. More delightful to our eyes than the stateliest pageantry,—more grateful to our ears than the fullest harmony,—are the sight and the sound of a young child at the knees of his parents, and amid the family circle, repeating the hymn he has been asked himself to select out of his little stock as his own especial favourite.

For all these reasons, we say, cultivate in children a taste for poetry. It is hardly a labour to do so; and in as far as it is one, it is nearly sure to be richly rewarded. But how is it to be done? This is the question to which we must now address ourselves.

When circumstances do not render it necessary, we confess we are not much disposed to address children with poetry peculiarly meant for them. Sir Walter Scott has one or two important observations bearing on this point, in the Preface to his "*Tales of a Grandfather*." He mentions that, having begun them in a childish style, he was gradually led to discard it, from remarking how much better pleased children are to be addressed in the language of adults than their own; and from considering how much safer it is to be somewhat above than at all below the level of their understanding. In the former case, we at least command their respect, and if things be well, we set their minds a-working;—in the latter there has been no respect called forth; the intended adaptation to themselves is seen at once; what is presented to them is not supposed to have any intrinsic merit or value, and being understood at a glance is dismissed as readily. *Trying to understand* is our own best and finest intellectual attitude; why may not children be permitted to put themselves in it, with less pride, less reluctance of every sort to stand in their way?

And in truth, experience has shown us that at a very early age children can be interested in the same poetry as their seniors, and all the more because it is the same. *The Pleasures of Hope!* What a burst of melody for the ear, of oratory for the nerves, of visionary rapture for the mind, was contained there when we were young! No cold criticism, no detection of verbosity, no inquisitorial exaction of meaning, no unfeeling discovery of redundancy interfered to stop the full enjoyment. We have even known very precocious children delighted with *Paradise Lost*; nor should we ever doubt the genuine character of their pleasure therein.

Where, therefore, the treasures of English poetry are accessible, we vote for educating a child by means of them, by selections from them, (not in an elocution-book, but in the instructions of a living parent or teacher,) by pointing out their beauties, by awakening

inquiry into them. Let the leisure hours of an intelligent and thoughtful child admit him into the family circle, let him be recognised as a participator in his measure in the family tastes, let him be taught to count it a favour to hear good poetry well read, and it will matter little that you go above and beyond his range. Among your scatterings you may count on depositing much precious seed.

Where there is the wish to connect this highest of arts with the highest of all subjects, the means will not be wanting. Among the many privileges of Englishmen, not the least is the amount of religious poetry of which their language is the vehicle, and which is, by consequence, their birthright; and there is a succession downwards from Spenser, which, used in subordination to more direct means of grace, and with prayer to the Giver of grace, might well be turned to far more account, and prove a far more efficacious influence for good on the minds of their offspring, than parents for the most part dream of.

This, however, is not always practicable, and for many schools, especially those designed for the middling and lower classes, it is manifestly out of the question. Even here, however, we ought to beware of visibly condescending. What we offer to our pupils, whether in prose or verse, must be manly and vigorous, such as shall task the mind, and make it mount instead of pulling it down. Selections from our really standard poets seem the most available plan in such cases, as indeed they are in all during the hours of direct learning. Such a compilation as "the Book of Poetry," which we noticed last summer,\* will be found most suitable; and there is no reason why it should not have many companions.

For the lower orders, however, we must mainly confine ourselves to religious poetry, and to religious poetry in the form of hymns. And it is here, unluckily, that our language is poorest. We have so little good congregational poetry,—so little that is at once pious, catholic, and poetical, that in all selections the whole of our little wealth should be exhibited. We ought to give, and to give uninjured, the very few really fine hymns we possess. For this reason we must complain that in two of the very excellent books at the head of our article, "The Child's Christian Year," and the "Selection of Hymns" put forth by the Christian Knowledge Society, we look in vain for the truly grand Easter Hymn, "Jesus Christ is risen to-day." Again, in the latter, we have two or three stanzas of Bishop Ken's Morning, two or three of his Evening, and about as many of his Midnight Hymn. Why not, if their length be inconvenient, trust the teacher with the work of selection? As it is, in the Morning Hymn, the stanza, "Wake and lift up thyself, my heart," is omitted; and yet we are sure it is an universal favourite. In that for Midnight we search in vain for the most poetical part, beginning from "All praise to Thee, in light array'd." Again, in that beautiful hymn of Cowper's, "Far from the

\* Christian Remembrancer, New Series, vol. ii. p. 49.

world, O Lord, I flee," the editor has stopped short at a stanza which we think he can hardly have seen, for we cannot imagine that in that case he could have had the heart to omit it:—

There like the nightingale she pours  
Her solitary lays,  
Nor asks a witness of her song,  
Nor thirsts for human praise.

Had we time, we might carp at one or two other things in this little book; but we gladly forbear, because, on the whole, we can cordially recommend it, as being pretty nearly as good as the design permitted. The following Evening Hymns please us much, both for their intrinsic merit, and also because their structure strikes us as advantageous:—

#### EVENING HYMN.

Through the day thy love hath spar'd us,  
Wearied we lie down to rest;  
Through the silent watches guard us,  
Let no foe our peace molest.  
Saviour, Thou our guardian be,  
Sweet it is to trust in Thee.

#### EVENING HYMN.

God of Israel, we adore Thee!  
Thou hast kept us through the day;  
Thus preserv'd we come before Thee,  
Ours the new and living way.  
Safely keep us through the night;  
Guard us till the morning light;  
Nor forsake us,  
Till Thou take us  
Far from earth to dwell with Thee  
Through a bright eternity.

"The Child's Christian Year," coming out under the superintendence, and partly, we presume, composed by the author of the "Christian Year," will, we are sure, be hailed with delight by numbers. We need hardly say that the faults to which we have been too long accustomed, are not to be met with here. There is no false taste—no irreverent familiarity of address—no intrusive dogmatism. Neither has Mr. Keble fallen into the error which we have already deprecated, of condescending too much. He thus deals with the question in a short supplement to his preface:—

"The first impression on looking over this little book will probably be that the hymns are too difficult, yet it is hoped they will not be thrown aside without a trial, nor without being read in connexion with the services of the day, which will often be found to clear up what otherwise appears obscure.

"It should likewise be considered that such subjects cannot be lowered to the level of childish minds without more or less of irreverence; and if we observe the Church's method of teaching, we shall find that she places in the memories of her young members a form of sound words, the full understanding of which neither they nor their teachers can arrive at.

"In the school for which the hymns were collected, they have been found useful in leading to questions and explanations, and the demand for them is such as to make the supply in manuscript rather troublesome."

We have but two hints to give. Children can enjoy none but *sonorous* verses. The smaller and more delicate melodies which often characterize Mr. Keble's poetry are rather too fine for ears which still require cultivation. Neither should they be presented with anything intricate in the way of versification, with any more than commonly varied metres. Such their ears are quite unable to follow; just as whilst they can relish tunes, they have no fancy for elaborate pieces of music. Dryden's great Ode for St. Cecilia's Day was in most of the old elocution books; and a very good exercise it may be in the way of placing accents and emphasis; but no child, we are sure, ever could tolerate the poem. Its wonderful execution (nearly the only merit that any one ever found in it) is a merit which they are quite unable to perceive. For which reason many excellent little poems, both in "The Child's Christian Year," and in the "Hymns for Children on the Lord's Prayer, &c.," a book which, along with that we have just been noticing, we cordially recommend—seem to us unsuited to their purpose.

One other little volume is on our list, "Hymns for Childhood," by Felicia Hemans. Though new to us, it appears, from the title-page, that it is but a new edition; consequently it may be known to many of our readers. It seems, to our apprehensions, nearer the mark as regards manner and execution, than any of those we have hitherto noticed; though it does not embrace such important or such directly christian subjects. We have always admired the genius of Mrs. Hemans. She was a mannerist, perhaps; but the manner was a very happy one. Her ear was fine, and her verse most musical. In the present little book she wisely adhered to the common metres, such as a child must every where encounter, and such as his ear can easily catch. We cordially recommend our readers to place themselves above the necessity of deriving their notions of any of the books now before us from what we have said; but by way of samples of the last three, let them now read a hymn from each:—

## HYMN V.

"Thy will be done in earth, as it is in heaven."

We dwell with wonders all around:  
Above, below, where'er we turn,  
A world of loveliness is found,—  
Sweet flowers that spring, bright stars that burn;  
But there's an unseen world of bliss,  
Far, far more beautiful than this.

'Tis there the blessed angels dwell,  
In glorious fields of light above;  
They do their Maker's will so well,  
That all is happiness and love.  
God thence has sent them now and then,  
To bring glad tidings down to men.

Yet little of their forms we know,  
 For few their heavenly shape have seen;  
 And sometimes when they came below,  
 They veil'd themselves in mortal mien.  
 Nor can we tell what joys sublime,  
 And blissful tasks employ their time.

We only know their faces shine  
 With dazzling rays, as lightnings bright;  
 Their garments, wrought in looms divine,  
 Glitter with pure celestial light;  
 On earth they watch o'er good men's ways,  
 And sing in heaven high notes of praise.

And may we, sinners frail on earth,  
 Hope, pray, and strive as good to be,  
 As angels pure of heavenly birth,  
 Who serve their God so willingly!  
 Oh, let us prize this precious prayer,  
 That bids us be what angels are!

*Hymns for Children, pp. 12, 13.*

#### EVENING HYMN.

"Thou art about my path, and about my bed, and spiest out all my ways."

PSALM CXXXIX. 2.

Father! by Thy love and power  
 Comes again the evening hour.  
 Light has vanish'd, labours cease,  
 Weary creatures rest in peace.  
 Thou whose genial dews distil  
 On the lowliest weed that grows;  
 Father! guard our couch from ill,  
 Lull Thy creatures to repose.  
 We to Thee ourselves resign,  
 Let our latest thoughts be Thine!  
 Saviour! to Thy Father bear  
 This our feeble evening prayer;  
 Thou hast seen how oft to-day  
 We, like sheep, have gone astray;  
 Worldly thoughts, and thoughts of pride,  
 Wishes to Thy Cross untrue,  
 Secret faults, and undescried,  
 Meet Thy spirit-piercing view:  
 Blessed Saviour! yet through Thee,  
 Pray that these may pardon'd be!  
 Holy Spirit! breath of balm!  
 Fall on us in evening's calm:  
 Yet, awhile, before we sleep,  
 We, with Thee, will vigils keep;  
 Lead us on our sins to muse,  
 Give us truest penitence,  
 Then the love of God infuse,  
 Breathing humble confidence;  
 Melt our spirits, mould our will,  
 Soften, strengthen, comfort, still.  
 Blessed Trinity! be near  
 Through the hours of darkness drear;  
 When the help of man is far,  
 Ye more clearly present are;



Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,  
 Watch o'er our defenceless head !  
 Let your Angels' guardian host  
 Keep all evil from our bed,  
 'Till the flood of morning rays  
 Wake us to a song of praise !

" I will lay me down in peace, and take my rest; for it is Thou, Lord, only, that makest me dwell in safety."—PSALM iv. 2.

*Child's Christian Year*, pp. xi. xii.

### THE NIGHTINGALE.

*Child's Evening Hymn.*

When twilight's grey and pensive hour  
 Brings the low breeze, and shuts the flower,  
 And bids the solitary star  
 Shine in pale beauty from afar ;

When gathering shades the landscape veil,  
 And peasants seek their village-dale,  
 And mists from river-wave arise,  
 And dew in every blossom lies :

When evening's primrose opes to shed  
 Soft fragrance round her grassy bed ;  
 When glow-worms in the wood-walk light  
 Their lamp, to cheer the traveller's sight ;

At that calm hour, so still, so pale,  
 Awakes the lonely Nightingale ;  
 And from a hermitage of shade  
 Fills with her voice the forest-glade ;

And sweeter far that melting voice,  
 Than all which through the day rejoice ;  
 And still shall bard and wanderer love  
 The twilight music of the grove.

Father in heaven ! oh, thus when day  
 With all its cares hath pass'd away,  
 And silent hours waft peace on earth,  
 And hush the louder strains of mirth ;  
 Thus may sweet songs of praise and prayer  
 To Thee my spirit's offering bear ;  
 Yon star, my signal, set on high,  
 For vesper-hymns of piety.

So may Thy mercy and Thy power  
 Protect me through the midnight hour ;  
 And balmy sleep and visions blest  
 Smile on Thy servant's bed of rest.

*Hymns for Childhood*, pp. 37—39.

Since we received the "*Child's Christian Year*," an illustrated edition has come out, with beautifully executed ornamental headings and tail-pieces, in the outline style of wood-cuts. Should yet another edition be called for, which is likely enough, we recommend, in addition to what we have said, more direct adaptation to the services of each day.

## UNPUBLISHED LETTERS RELATING TO ARCHBISHOP BECKET.

### I.

WERE we to place as much dependence on the monkish chroniclers of the eleventh and twelfth centuries in respect of motives as we do for facts, our knowledge of the secret springs of action would shrink into a mere nothing. To them, the assassination of a king, the murder of a bishop, the laying waste of a neighbouring province, the sacking of a cathedral or a monastery, are mere acts of murder, sacrilege, or lawless violence, and nothing more. Even if he had the inclination, the chronicler had not, in most cases, the power of accompanying his tale of murder or rapine with an exposition of the motives which had led to the commission of the acts. For the secret motives we must look to the private letters of the actors and their contemporaries,—of the men who perpetrated or consented to the deed of violence. In them, and in them alone, shall we find the kernel of which the chronicler has given us only the shell. Fortunately for us, the collections of letters relating to those centuries are very numerous, and throw a very full light on the state of manners and of feelings in France, Italy, and England, in those troublous times. To confine ourselves to our own country: we have the letters of Anselm, giving us Normandy and England in the days of the Conqueror and his son Rufus; John of Salisbury and the contributors to the Becket Letters continue the sketch to the middle of the reign of Henry the Second, where it is finally and fully illustrated, by the pungent letters of that sovereign's greatest favourite, Peter of Blois, Archdeacon of London.

The Becket Letters, with which our present purpose is, are some four hundred and more epistles written by the leading men in Rome, England, France, and Germany, at the time of the contest between the king and the primate, and collected, according to tradition, by John of Salisbury. It is a matter of little moment who it was who first arranged this mass of letters; their genuineness is unquestionable; of their value there can be no doubt. In the year 1682 Cardinal Lupus, under the direction and with the sanction of the see of Rome, printed the greater portion of these letters from the MS. of them in the Vatican Library; and these it is which the late Mr. Froude so ably translated. Besides those already printed, which we are informed was not, by a hundred, the full contents of the Vatican MS., the various copies of them extant in the MS. collections of this country contain many of interest and importance, especially the copies in the Cottonian and Arundel MSS. in the British Museum; that in the Lumley collection at Lambeth Palace; and that in the collection left by Archbishop Parker to the College of Corpus Christi in Cambridge.

Convinced that it is from such documents alone that we can realize to ourselves the judgment, the feelings, and the social condition of any particular age; well assured that it is they alone that can faithfully convey to us the hopes and fears by which the actors of the time were agitated, and that, as such, they are the most precious records for all who wish to study mankind; it is our intention in this and the following articles to collate and publish such of the letters in the MSS. of our own country as have not as yet been printed, and which serve to illustrate points of varied interest in the eventful history of the contest between Henry and the Archbishop. The writer had doubted whether or not he should present the letters in their original language, or attempt to clothe them with an English dress. After advice and consideration it has been determined to produce them in their native language, and to assist the reader in understanding their import by a moderate preface and running commentary. The difficulty, if not impossibility, of preserving the spirit of the original in a translation; of transforming into English idioms the thoughts and feelings of men, who, for the most part, thought in Latin; and the loss of authority always consequent on the substitution of translations in the place of the original, were the main reasons for this decision.

Passing by the traditions of his Saracenic origin by his mother's side, in the year 1130 we find Becket, as yet a young man, (having received a more than ordinary education at the monastery of Merton, in Surrey, and afterwards at the universities of Paris and Oxford,) employed in some minor capacity in the office of his father's successor in the shrievalty of London. Thence we trace him to the palace of Theobald, his predecessor in the see of Canterbury, where, according to Fitzstephen, he was introduced by his father's friends, Archdeacon Baldwin and his brother Eustace. His urbane manners, his talent for the study of civil law, his aptness for diplomacy, obtained for Becket, even in his early years, several foreign missions, during which he perfected his knowledge of civil law, under the most celebrated professors of Bologna and Auxerre. It was on his return from these missions that Becket received his first preferments from the hand of Theobald. In the year 1158, Henry raised Becket to the chancellorship, then, for the first time since the Conquest, held by an Englishman. What the king's reasons were for raising so young an ecclesiastic to the important place of chancellor the records of those days do not enable us to determine. Be his reasons what they might, Henry did not err in his choice; every writer has testified to the able conduct of Becket during his chancellorship, though it can hardly be doubted, unless the statements of the chroniclers are to be entirely disregarded, that towards his own order he acted rather as a statesman than as an ecclesiastic. On the death of the pious and estimable Theobald, Henry determined on straining every nerve to raise the chancellor to the vacant primacy. The reasons by which the king was actuated, and the manner in which the elevation to the

primacy was effected, have ever been questions of dispute among the biographers of Becket. To enter into these discussions now would hardly be relevant; suffice it to say, that in the life and ecclesiastical history of the primate, put forth under the sanction of the see of Rome, the writer assigns as a reason for his election, that "the king, having had manifold trial of him, deemed his magnanimity and fidelity fit for so high a dignity; and also that he would have a care of his people, and govern all things in the Church and the common weal to his good liking." The same expectation on the part of the king of Becket's obsequiousness is admitted by Fitzstephen, Grime, and a MS. life of the date of Henry II., in the library at Lambeth, showing, that, in the opinion of the primate's contemporaries, the king entertained such an expectation from his acts as chancellor. As for the other point, without laying any stress on the admissions of the Lambeth MS., the Life of Grime, and the History of William of Newborough, we have Becket's own admission, that "he did not ascend into the fold of Christ by the true way, not having been called by canonical election, but obtruded by the terror of the secular arm." On the 2d of June, 1162, Becket was ordained a priest, and on the day following consecrated archbishop.

Here arises another question, of late much mooted,—the until lately admitted change of habits and manners, which one party have ever held up as a mark of his hypocrisy, the other as a sign of his sincerity. The late Mr. Froude took up a new line of argument; on the authority of certain passages in the letters, he denied the fact of the change. The matter seems now to stand thus: all sides admit, in accordance with the statements of the chroniclers and biographers, the magnificence and luxury of Becket during his chancellorship. On the authority of three isolated passages in the letters, one of which is contradicted by the sentence which follows it, and the rest of which admit of explanation, Mr. Froude held that no such change took place, as was usually admitted, on Becket's elevation to the primacy. It would be a matter of sorrow, had such really been the case. On the other side, the testimony in favour of the change, even to its greatest extent, is unanimous among the contemporary writers. That he endeavoured, by deeds of clarity, and by self-mortification, to atone in some degree for the errors of his former life, is surely no sign of hypocrisy; nay, rather, it is to the honour of the repentant primate.

It was not long before disputes about the possessions of the see of Canterbury, and the right of excommunicating a king's tenant, greatly embittered that hatred which Henry had conceived against his former friend, immediately on his resignation of the chancellorship, as incompatible with his primacy. Peace, however, was made between them, until the disputes at Clarendon once more awoke their feud.

Henry, desirous of compelling the clergy to be tried in criminal cases by the courts of common law, and perhaps stimulated by a

laxity of discipline, then too prevalent in the Church in England, of his own authority issued certain orders for the trial and punishment of clerical offenders. These orders, as illegal, the bishops unanimously opposed, and the king, conscious of his error, called them together at Westminster in council, and required of them jurisdiction over clerical offenders. This, they all, save one, denied; and when the king required them to observe the customs of the land, they pleaded their order. In a violent fit of passion, Henry broke up the council. Many of the bishops changed their minds on the breaking up of the council, and endeavoured to persuade the primate to join them in yielding their assent to the king's wishes. Influenced by a message from the pope, Becket went to the king at Woodstock, and promised that he would observe the customs of the land. With this the king was unhappily not content, but determined on having the private promise ratified in parliament. In January, 1164, the king met his parliament at Clarendon, and demanded of his clergy their public acquiescence to the customs of the realm. All agreed, save Becket. The king's anger was unbounded. After much solicitation by his clergy and his friends, the primate yielded. According to Grime he said, "' I yield to the councils of the king, and I bow to his will; ' and then before all present, he promised in good faith to observe and keep the laws and customs of the realm." "To avoid disputes," said the king, "let the laws and customs of my grandfather Henry be reduced into writing, and subscribed by us all." The king's commissioners retired for this purpose, and on their return presented the roll of the sixteen constitutions of Clarendon. To affix his seal to these Becket refused; he had promised to observe the laws and customs of the realm, not to confirm them with his hand and seal. Though refused at Clarendon, the otherwise extraordinary proceedings of the king at Northampton, and the statement by Grime of the mission of the bishop of Evreux, would warrant us in concluding that the primate's signature was obtained, though after much delay.

It was not very long after this parliament that the great council of the king was held at Northampton, where a most cruel persecution was commenced against Becket. A charge of constructive treason, in not obeying the king's summons, until then always redeemable on a trifling fine, was punished with the exorbitant mulct of five hundred pounds. This was followed by several demands on the part of the king for balances stated to be due on the old accounts of the chancellorship. That these demands were against all honour and equity no one can doubt; that they were illegal is equally certain, if we may believe Edmund Grime's circumstantial account how the accredited agents of the king, at the council at London, pronounced the chancellor to be free: "*Ex ore regis, ab omni calumpnia et exactione nunc et in omne tempus.*" As difficulties and dangers crowded round the primate; as friend after friend fell away before the violence of the king, the temper of Becket exhibited greater firmness, greater forbearance.

His conduct before the parliament at Northampton was truly that of a martyr for conscience sake. Having appealed to the pope, the primate left the council, and on the day following fled to France, where the abbey of St. Bertin received the fugitive. Soon afterwards he had an interview with Louis at Soissons, and proceeded from thence, under a French escort, to the Roman court at Sens, to plead his cause before the tribunal to which he had appealed.

The pope, weak and vacillating, and too dependent on the support of Louis and Henry to dare to offend either party, refused the request, as well of the king, as of Becket. He would neither bring the cause into his own presence, nor send legates into England to try it there. On this the primate retired to the monastery of Pontigni, leaving John of Salisbury to conduct his matter at Sens: whilst Henry gratified his resentment by driving into exile every one connected with Becket, confiscating their goods, and leaving them to find subsistence from the charity of foreigners. Nothing was done until Henry, perhaps more to frighten Alexander than with the real intention of placing England under the anti-pope, placed himself in communication with the schismatical court of Germany. In consequence of this threat, Alexander required the Bishop of London to command Henry to restore Becket to his see, and make restoration to those whose property he had confiscated, and whose persons he had banished. In the same letter in which these commands are conveyed, Alexander exposes the state of his finances.

"Hereby, therefore, we authorise you to make a faithful collection of Peter's pence throughout all England for the current year, and to transmit the amount to us as soon as possible. We request, moreover, that, before the aforesaid collection is completed, you will furnish us with such a supply of money as your own resources or your credit can procure, and transmit it before the ensuing first of August. You may repay the loan out of the collection."\*

In reply to this letter, Gilbert, Bishop of London, was commanded to make the king's excuses. At the same time he declined affording the required loan, because, he tells the pope, "no one through the whole kingdom would have paid the slightest attention to us in the matter of Peter's pence, unless the king had backed our applications with his royal mandate."† Alexander, unable to risk the loss of the money, declared himself satisfied with the excuses, and requested Gilbert to forward the collection to him by the hands of the abbot of St. Bertin.‡ Such was his tone in August 1165. In the beginning of the next year, no compliance having taken place with any of his commands, the pope commanded Henry forthwith to receive the primate with the honour due to his station, and to reinstate the exiles in their rights and possessions.

"Furthermore," says the pope, "we wish your discretion (the Bishop of London) to take notice, that we hereby authorise and command you to pay over to the abbot of St. Bertin's the full amount of Peter's pence which is

\* *Divi Thomæ*, Ep. i. 37.

† Ep. i. 38.

‡ Ep. i. 41.



at present due to us in England. Your discretion should be aware of information we have received from our brother, the venerable Bartholomew, Bishop of Exeter, who tells us that the tax has been generally raised on a defective valuation, but that his diocese has paid in full, and that the sum is now in your hands. We marvel greatly that it has not been forwarded. We will you, moreover, to make good the former deficiencies, and on the present occasion to enforce full payment."\*

This letter was the prelude to one to Becket, bidding him remain quiet until Easter, and holding out hopes, that after that time Becket, as well as the pope, might adopt more rigorous measures.† The critical period of Easter, 1166, arrived, without any reconciliation having been effected, and within ten days after the pope commanded the bishops of the province of Canterbury to make restitution, under pain of excommunication; and Becket, free to use all his powers, at first entreated and afterwards commanded the king and the bishops to restore him and his fellow exiles to their rights and possessions. His letter to the king concluded with these words: "otherwise, know for certain that you shall feel the vengeance of God." Well understanding those words, the bishops and the king anticipated the sentence of excommunication by an appeal to the pope, because the primate had suspended the Bishop of Salisbury without the king's consent, and threatened to excommunicate the king. The day for their appeal was Ascension-day, 1167. Before the notice of the appeal could reach Becket, the primate, after a pilgrimage to Soissons, had proceeded to Vezelay, and there, with all due form, excommunicated John of Oxford, for his heresy in communicating with the anti-pope, and for his usurpation of the deanery of Salisbury. He likewise excommunicated the Archdeacon of Poitiers, and several laymen, for interfering with the possessions of the see of Canterbury, and "all others who for the future shall put forth their hands against the goods and property of the Church of Canterbury, or ill use or interfere with those for whose necessities they have been set apart."‡

During the time of this appeal, namely, between July 1166 and June 1169, the following letter is to be placed, in which Gilbert Foliot informs Henry of his having again received the commands of the pope to forward to him as quickly as possible the Peter's pence then due to him from England, and solicits his mandate to the justices, without which, we have before seen, no one in the realm would have listened to the bishop's request, so little power had the papal commands in England in that day. The bishop also reminds the king of the approach of the day on which their appeal was to conclude, and when, unless something was effected in the meantime, the powers of the excommunications of the archbishop could no longer be evaded.

"Henrico, Regi Angliæ, Gillebertus Londoniensis Episcopus.

"Domino suo charissimo, illustri Anglorum Regi, Henrico, frater Gille-

\* Ep. i. 74.

† Ep. i. 43.

‡ Ep. i. 140.

bertus, Londoniensis Ecclesiæ Minister, pedibus sanctis conculcato Sathan, in Christo triumphare feliciter.

"Mandatum Domini Papæ nuper accepimus, quo nobis iungitur ut census Beati Petri a fratribus et coepiscopis nostris suscipiamus, et per nuncios quos direxit ad nos, ipsi cito transmittamus.

"Quod quia de vestra totum pendet misericordiâ, nec potest effectu compleri nisi per vos, vestræ id notificamus Excellentiæ, ut vestris, si placet, iusticiariis superscribatis, et quod vestræ voluntati placuerit id fieri præcipiatis.

"Optamus autem, ut cor vestrum divinitas sancta possideat, et actus vestros sic disponat et dirigat, ut nec in Deum offendatis, nec adversum vos aut regnum vestrum domino Papæ, quem plurimum dilexisse novimus, justam querelæ causam et materiam præbeatis.

"De cætero, dies instat, quem appellationi ad dominum Papam factæ præfiximus; de quâ persequendâ, necesse est nobis, ut voluntatem vestram et consilium animo certius agnoscamus. Nam cum minus lædant jacula quæ pervidentur, timendum nobis est, ne, si ad monitum temporis omnia reserventur, singula quæ præscita minus et minus pertractata fuerint, eo minus commode quam exigat, expédiantur. Inscribebat cordi vestro digitus Dei quid fieri expédiat, et vos manus ejus ubique protegat atque custodiat, Domine in Christo dilectissime."\*

In order to conciliate Alexander, the king issued the usual license required, and after writing to the cardinals at Rome for their aid, sent his firm adherent, John of Oxford, one of those on whom Becket had placed the sentence of excommunication, to manage his cause at the papal court. The Roman court, open to corruption, and grossly venal at that date, set on foot a scheme for instituting a legatine commission, for the purpose of examining and deciding the points at issue between the king and the primate; and in the latter part of the year 1166, William, Cardinal of Pavia, and Henry of Pisa, were spoken of for legates. The influence of John of Oxford was distinctly recognised in the obtaining the remission of the cause from the papal court to one of a secondary nature, as well as in the admitted bias of the legates. Becket, warned by his friends of the character of the commissioners,—informed that "one was light and capricious, the other crafty and intriguing, and both greedy and avaricious,"† "whose eyes presents would easily shut, and reconcile to any wickedness,"—expressed his greatest reluctance to submit to the decision of any one, save Alexander himself. These reasons he stated in his remonstrance to his holiness, and to one of the legates, Henry of Pisa; whilst in his private letters to his friends Hyacinth and Bosò, he beseeches them to aid him in his difficulties, "as a presbyter cleric of William of Pavia had lately promised the king of England, that his lord, on accepting a legatine commission, would terminate this cause to his liking."‡ The following letter to Conrad, Archbishop of Mayence, expresses similar fears, partly in similar words:—

"Thomas, Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus Conrado Moguntino Archiepiscopo.||

"Omnia nostra ideo vestra reputamus, quia nos ipsi omnino vestri sumus; sufficere debet hoc ad persuasionem.

\* Cotton. MS. Claudius B. ii. lib. 1. ep. 121.

† Ep. i. 111.

‡ Ep. i. 135.

|| Cott. MS. Claud. B. ii. lib. 1. ep. 130.

"Petimus itaque ut nostræ perspiciatis necessitati, quam ex rescripto literarum quas domino Papæ mittimus advertetis. Illud enim mittimus vobis non minus confidentes de vobis quam de nobis, quia de vestris negotiis æque sollicitamur ac nostris.

"Ecce Johannes, ille schismaticus de Oxenfordia, qui perjurio suo nostrum quantum potuit procuravit exilium, sedem apostolicam appetit, ut eam circumveniat et subruat æquitatem. Rogamus ut ei respondeat iniquitas sua, et domi sentiat esse Petrum, qui, quicquid iterato dejeret, eum coram regibus et principibus ausus est impugnare. Discat prophetam esse in Israel, qui tempore accepto justicias judicet.

"Presbiter clericus Domini Willelmi Papiensis, regi Anglorum, nuper promisit, quod dominus suus, legatione acceptâ, causam quæ inter nos et ipsum vertitur ad voluntatem ejus definiet; et de nostrâ depositione tam gloriantur palam hostes ecclesiæ, persecutores nostri, immo Christi.

"Nos autem, nisi inevitabilis necessitas cogat, nullius excipiemus judicium, ni Domini Papæ; magis ecclesiæ subversionem Anglicanæ et Romanæ confusionem, quam nostram, timentes. Vigilate, ergo, apud Dominum Papam et Cardinales; ut saluti suæ perspiciant coram Deo et honori coram hominibus. Nam, quicquid in alterutrâ parte fecerint, memoriale erit in seculum seculi."

The interest of the king at the Roman court outweighed that of Becket and his friends, and by the end of the year the papal letters had been issued, appointing William of Pisa and Cardinal Otho legates for deciding the points under dispute. Leaving the effects of this commission for our next article, let us consider three other letters, which the first book of the Cotton MS. affords us.

The first of these is from Lewis of France to Manuel Comnenus, Emperor of the Romans, by the hands of Theobald, the venerable prior of Crepi, wherein, after more gracious salutations and kindly expressions than are to be met with even in the exordium of epistles of that date, he recommends the venerable bearer, of whose learning, sanctity, and reputation he speaks in the highest terms, to the consideration of his regal brother. Besides the mission which is openly stated in the letter, of collecting supplies for the monastery of Cluny, there were other secret instructions of which he was the bearer, more proper to be committed to the faith of Theobald than to writing. These secret instructions would not arrest the attention, were it not that we find in the following letter the same person introduced to the king of Sicily, with the self-same instructions, and did we not know that among those who received the exiled friends of Becket was William of Sicily, and, that that king, being now firmly fixed on his throne, was one of the most strenuous supporters of the papal cause, whilst at the same time his clergy were ardent in support of Becket, and the personal feelings of the king himself had been clearly demonstrated to be on the side of the exiled primate. It was now more than a century since the churches of the east and west had been divided by the excommunication of Cerularius. The mission of a prior of a Latin convent to the court of Constantinople, under the recommendation of the greatest supporter of the western church, with a commission to solicit alms for another Latin convent, is an interesting proof how far from schismatic the Latin church

regarded the separation of their eastern brethren. The desire entertained by Manuel of reuniting the eastern and western empires under his own sceptre, and of overthrowing the Emperor Henry, might be a reason for the mission, as far as the secrets to be communicated were concerned; the ostensible reason, however, was the soliciting the aid of the Greek church for a famous but poor Latin convent. The passage in the letter to Manuel in which Lewis speaks of the kind reception he obtained from the emperor after his ill-fated crusade, would, as we cannot suppose the sentence ironical, go far to refute the popular tradition of the detention, if not imprisonment, of the king of France by the Byzantine; whilst the similar passage in the letter to William of Sicily, in which he speaks of the kindness of his grandfather Roger to him and his fellow-wanderers, warrants us in believing that the Sicilian admiral, when he defied the Greek emperor, assisted in the conveyance of Louis and his defeated host from a land where his stay was all but per force, though he might not, as the Sicilian historians boast, "have liberated the king of France from the dungeons of Constantinople, where he bearded the Greek lion in his den."

"Ludovicus, Rex Franciæ, Manueli, Imperatori Constantinopolitano.\*

"Manueli, Dei gratiâ illustri et glorioso Romanorum imperatori, semper augusto, venerabili fratri et amico charissimo, Ludovicus eâdem gratiâ rex Francorum, salutem et ei fideliter et feliciter adhærere qui regna largitur et transfert imperia.

"Honor, quem nobis in Domino peregrinantibus apud vos exhibuistis, Deo auctore, a memoriâ nostrâ nunquam excidet; et licet nos maria et intrajectorum regnorum intersticia separent, nullâ tamen vis meritis vestris debitam excutiat nobis caritatem. Inde est, quod de vestrâ prosperitate lætamur ut nostrâ; æmulis vestris, quod nostris, optamus evenire; promptum gerentes animum, si Deus opportunitatem dederit, vestram in Domino implere voluntatem et gloriam dilatare.

"Ut autem vos de nostro et nos de vestro statu faciat certiores, latori presentium, Theobaldo, venerabili Priori Crispiacensis ecclesiæ, dedimus in mandatis, ut imperialem adeat majestatem, et ad thronum celsitudinis vestræ secreta perferat, quæ potius fidei ejus quam litteris censuimus imprimenda. Est enim vir litteris eruditus, morum sanctitate conspicuus, præclari nominis, et nobis admodum familiaris. Unde, præ cæteris qui in ordine suo perfecti habebantur, electus est procurare necessitates ecclesiæ Cluniacensis, quæ non modo monasticorum regni nostri capud† extitit a diebus antiquis, sed in toto orbo Latino monasticæ religionis præ cæteris obtinuit gloriam.

"Imperatorem ergo clementiam imploramus, ut tantum virum condecere admittat, verba nostra quæ posuimus in ore ejus audiat diligenter, et misericorditer exaudiat preces ejus, et respiciat ecclesiæ necessitatem."‡

The date of this and the following letter cannot be earlier than 1166, and is most probably in the end of that year or early in the succeeding.

\* Manuel Comnenus, son of John, Emperor from 1143 to 1180, during whose reign the rule of the Normans under Count Roger was established in Sicily, and the Roman Emperors, after fruitless efforts to recover their dominion, were obliged to rest content with hardly a nominal sovereignty.

† Sic in manuscripto.

‡ Cotton. MS. Claud. B. ii. lib. 1. ep. 180.

"Ludovicus Rex, Willemmo, Rex Siciliae.\*

"Ludovicus, Dei gratiâ Rex Francorum, illustri Regi Siciliae Willemmo, venerabili fratri et amico suo charissimo, salutem, et ei jugiter adherere qui dat salutem regibus.

"Honor quem nobis, magnificus avus tuus, in obsequio Dei peregrinantibus exhibuit, liberalitas quam in nos et comperegrinantes exercuit, consolatio multiplex, quam fessis et laborantibus, devotus impendit, à memoriâ nostrâ recedere nequeunt; sed animum nostrum indesinenter accendant.

"Utinam devotio quam habemus ad vos possit operis exhibitione clarescere, et effectus meriti conspicuum testimonium reddat affectui promerendi. Gratus enim esset, nec si opportunitas divinitus aperiretur, obsequium vobis rependere, quam tunc fuerit illud a nostris progenitoribus accepisse. Magnique muneris instar erit, si decreveritis imperare, quod desiderio nostro paret materiam obsequendi.

"Licet enim nos interjacentium terrarum spatia separent, et obsequiorum vicissitudines intercludant, ferventissimam tamen a pectore nostro nequeunt excludere caritatem, quin prosperis vestris congaudeamus ut nostris, et adversa quotiens audiuntur feramus ut nostra. Proinde quod honori vestro et gloriâ credimus inservire, secure petimus et sincerâ consulimus caritate, sicut preces vestras admittere prompti sumus, et similiter expediendi consilio obedire.

"Nobilis vir Stephanus,† quem familiaritatis vestræ honore sullimastis, caro et sanguis noster est, et clarissimos procures regni Francorum cognatione vel affinitate contingit. Qualiter autem, ad ignominiam generis et gentis suæ, dejectus sit et ejectus, prudentia vestra tanto certius recolit, quanto quæ circa eum gesta sunt insidiantium fraude, clarius per præsentiam intellexit. Rogamus ergo affectuosius nobilitatem vestram, ut eum, ad gloriam nominis vestri, et regni Francorum consolationem, curetis maturius revocare, eumque restituatis in integrum amoris, familiaritatis, honoris, et dignitatis.

"Ob hanc causam, et alias quas scripto non duximus committendas, latorem presentium, Theobaldum, venerabilem Crispiacensis ecclesiæ priorem, ad Excellentiam vestram fiducialiter destinavimus, cui, in his quæ vobis ex parte nostrâ dixerit, cedi postulamus ut nobis. Est enim vir fide plenus, reverendus titulo sanctitatis, litterarum eruditione præclarus, nobis admodum familiaris, carus et acceptus regno Francorum. Procurat autem necessitates nobilis ecclesiæ Cluniacensis in Oriente, in quibus eum a vestrâ sublimitate petimur benignius exaudiri, et efficacius promoveri.

"Gloriam vestram, ad honorem suum, in longa tempora promoveat et tueatur Rex regum et dominantium Dominus."‡

The next letter relates to the question of the right of the Archbishop of York to bear his cross before him, "per totam Angliam." Immediately on the election of Alexander (1159) Roger of York had presented his petition to the pope, praying him to confirm the letters of Honorius, by which he claimed the privilege in question. Alexander granted the petition, without hearing the other side, but on Becket's appealing to him in 1163, reversed his confirmation until the cause should be finally settled by the mediation of a "brother of

\* William the Second, surnamed the Good, grandson of Count Roger, succeeded his father, William the Bad, in 1166. Divi Thomæ, ep. i. iii.

† Stephanus, by birth a Norman, Archbishop elect of Palermo, who with Richard, Bishop elect of Syracuse, an Englishman, was very liberal in providing for the friends and adherents of Becket, when driven from England by the orders of Henry.

‡ Cotton. MS. Claud. B. ii. lib. i. ep. 181.

the Temple" whom he designed to send over "as a mediator between their lordships on the subject of the cross, and to settle any dispute that might arise in the interim." "At all events," says one of Becket's envoys, "the Archbishop of York is not to carry his cross in your diocese. This we obtained by dint of perseverance." The remonstrance of the Archbishop of York, in which he considered this reversal as a prejudging of his cause, seems to have called for the following letter from the pope. As this letter is as late, at least, as the year 1170, if not later, it would not have been introduced had it not been that it relates to that curious and long-pending dispute which was one of the troubles of Becket, as well as of his successors, for many years after.

"Alexander Papa Rogero Eboracensi Archiepiscopo Apostolicæ sedis legato.

"A memoriâ tuâ, non exiit in primo anno nostri promotionis scriptum litterarum felicitis memoriæ predecessoris nostri Honorii Papæ nobis feceritis præsentari. In quo continebatur antecessoribus tuis apostolicâ benignitate indultum fuisse, ut tam eis quam successoribus tuis, liberum esse per totam Angliam ante se crucem deferre. Nos vero eisdem antecessoris nostri vestigiis inhærentes transcripti nostri munimine confirmavimus quod antecessoribus tuis fuerat a predecessore nostro clementer indultum. Pmo\* dum autem sanctæ et venerandæ memoriæ Thomas quondam Cantuariensis Archiepiscopus existimans hoc in depressionem juris et dignitatis tuæ redundare, exinde cessit questionem morere et propter hoc ad sedem apostolicam appellavit, affirmans si bene meminimus, quod tibi vel prædecessoribus tuis nulla\* tenuis id licuisset. Sicque factum est quod nos tibi per scripta nostra perhibuimus ne in provincia Cantuariensis Ecclesiæ, donec de causa cognosceretur ante te crucem deferre aliquâ ratione auderes. Quare ergo per delectos filios nostros I. et A. clericos tuos, gravem nobis coram querimoniam deposuisti, asserens quod te, possessione hujus rei, quam tu et antecessores tui habueras, absque cognitione judicis spoliassetus."

"Nos volentes tibi tanquam venerabili frater deferre, et jura tua integra, illibata servare, præsentibus litteris statuimus, quod litteræ prohibitionis nostræ nullum tibi prejudicium faciant, quominus tibi et successoribus tuis liberum sit quemadmodum nobis privilegium beneficio indultum apostolicæ sedis, et tu et prædecessores tui id facere consuevistis ante vos per totam Angliam Crucem deferre, quousque definitiva sententia decernatur, [he had been at least ten years considering his judgment] an id ecclesia tua debeat de jure habere."

With this, to all appearance, portion of a letter, we close this introductory portion of the Becket letters, the proceeds of the first book of the Cottonian MS. It should not, however, be forgotten, that there is in that book another letter, one from Foliot, bishop of London, to Becket, in which a very different account of the meeting at Clarendon is afforded; an account, exculpatory of the bishops, and condemnatory, in the highest degree, of the primate; and at variance with the testimony of the best contemporary historians and biographers. It was this letter, this ex-parte pamphlet of Foliot's, which led astray Lord Lyttleton in his history of Henry II., and which a late writer, Mr. G. P. R. James, seems to have followed as of undoubted authority, one would almost suppose, without having read the whole of the

\* Sic in manuscripto.



letter, and certainly without having compared it with the witness of contemporary writers, or read Mr. Berington's reasons against the genuineness of the letter itself. Writers of history ought ever to bear in mind with what caution the witness of a solitary MS. is to be received, even when it does not run contrary to contemporary authority; and in what suspicion it is to be held, when it contradicts every writer on the same subject, and fails even of being consistent with itself. Of Mr. James's view of the contest between Henry and the primate, we shall have occasion to speak in our next article.

---

### ON THE DIVISION OF VERSES IN THE BIBLE.

THE invention, as it has been called, of the present division of the Bible into verses, with its numerical notation, is generally attributed to Robert Stephens. This has, in fact, become the received opinion. To ascertain how far the vulgar notion on this subject is borne out by evidence, as well as to examine into the part which this celebrated printer had in this division, is our present object. We shall commence with giving the whole of the proofs on which Robert Stephens's claim is founded to an invention which has been universally received throughout Christendom, and introduced into the printed copies of the Bible in all the dialects into which the Sacred Volume is translated.

The authorities, indeed, in favour of the vulgar opinion are so strong and so numerous, that to some it would probably appear a rash and absurd attempt to call it in question. Among these authorities may be reckoned Stephens himself, and his son Henry; and every subsequent writer seems to have assumed the fact as certain. We shall give an account of the principal of these authorities in chronological order, and then proceed to show the part which Stephens really had in this invention.

Robert Stephens took refuge in Geneva upon his leaving the Church of Rome and embracing Calvinism, in the year 1551,\* and published that same year the fourth edition of his Greek Testament, which first contained this division. This edition contains also the Latin Vulgate, and the version of Erasmus, and has in the title the date MDXLI.; but that this is a mistake for MDLI. is evident from the preface, in which he makes reference to the annotations to the New Testament which he had published ten years before.†

\* Moreri says that this took place in 1547, but this is evidently a mistake, although Maittaire is not fully satisfied that Stephens came to Geneva in 1551.

† "Lectori. Quum nobis in animo esset Novum Testamentum, ut est a veteri interprete Latine redditum, excudere, adjectis tantum brevioribus annotationibus, quales abhinc annos jam decem edideramus in Latinâ editione Novi Testamenti."—*Preface to Edition of 1551.*

Now, as he had published no annotations in the year 1531, nor indeed any edition whatever in that year, and as he makes a special reference in his Preface, to certain annotations which he had published ten years before, and which were attached to his edition of the Latin New Testament published in 1541,\* it cannot remain doubtful that this date is an error of the press, unless indeed there was some design in ascribing a false date to the edition. However this may be, the X of the date MDXLI. has been generally erased in all the copies. In the preface to this edition, Stephens observes,—“As to our having marked this work with certain versicles, as they call them, we have herein followed the most ancient Greek and Latin manuscripts of the New Testament, and have imitated them the more willingly, that each translation [viz. that of Erasmus and the Vulgate] may be made the more readily to correspond with the opposite Greek.”† In this edition the verses are broken up into short paragraphs, or breaks, each verse commencing the line, with the figures in the inner margin.

This edition was followed, in the year 1555, by one of the Latin Vulgate, containing the whole Bible, in large 8vo. with the present division of verses marked throughout with the Arabic numerals, not placed in the margin, but incorporated into the text, which runs on continuously without being broken up into paragraphs. It contains the following address to the reader from Robert Stephens:—“Here is an edition of the Latin Vulgate, in which each chapter is divided into verses, after the order of the Hebrew verses, with numbers prefixed, which correspond to the numbers of the verses which we have added in our new and complete Concordance, after the marginal letters A, B, C, D, E, F, G, in order that you may be relieved from the labour of searching for what these figures will point out to you as with the finger.”‡ The title-page bears Stephens's olive; and the name of the printer, Conrad Badius, at the end of the book, with the date 8 idibus Aprilis, 1555, shows where and when the book was printed. It was the first edition of the entire Latin Bible printed by Stephens since he left the Church of Rome. Of this edition, Le Long observes that it is distinguished from the preceding editions by its external form, in having the division of verses in the Old Testament as well as the New.§

\* The edition of 1541 bears the following title:—“Novum Testamentum. Breves variorum tralationum annotationes, adjectâ veterum Latinorum exemplarium MSS. diversâ lectione, cum præf. Robert. Steph. 2 vols. 8vo. Paris, ex officinâ Rob. Stephani, 1541.”

† “Quod autem per quosdam, ut vocant, versiculos opus distinximus, id, vetustissima Græca Latinaque ipsius Novi Testamenti exemplaria secuti, fecimus, ea autem libentius sumus imitati, quod hâc ratione utraque translatio posset omnino e regione Græco contextui correspondere.”—*Preface to Gr. and Lat. Test.*

‡ “Biblia. R. Stephanus Lectori. En tibi Bibliorum Vulgata editio, in quâ, juxta Hebræorum versuum rationem, singula capita versibus distincta sunt, numeris præfixis qui versuum numeris quos in concordantiis nostris novis et integris post literas marginales A, B, C, D, E, F, G, addidimus, respondent, ut quærendi molestiâ leveris, quum tibi tanquam digito quos quæris demonstrabunt.”

§ “Distinguitur hæc editio præcedentibus externâ formâ, nimirum distinctione versuum tam in Veteri tam in Novo Testamento.”

There are two other editions stated by Le Long to have been published in this and the next year at Lyons, containing the division into verses, the one printed by Frelon, and the other by Anthony Vincent. We shall have some remarks to make on these before we conclude.

The next edition is that called Vatable's Bible, published in 3 vols. folio, 1556—1557. This contains, arranged in parallel columns, the Old and New Testament of the Latin Vulgate, and the version of Pagnini from the Hebrew. The New Testament contains Beza's version, now published for the first time. The notes are those commonly ascribed to Vatable, with those of Claude Badwell on the apocryphal books.\* The verses are, as in the edition of the New Testament of 1551, broken up into sentences, and there is a notice to the reader prefixed, apprising him that this edition "contains the text divided into verses as in the Hebrew copies."†

The next authority for ascribing this invention to Robert Stephens is his son, the celebrated Henry Stephens, who records the fact both in his dedication to Sir Philip Sidney, prefixed to his second edition of the Greek Testament, in 1576, and in the preface to his Greek Concordance to the New Testament, published in 1594.

In the former of these he adverts in terms of strong regard to what he calls his "father's idea of the distribution of each chapter of the book into a certain number of verses; and asserts that nearly the whole christian world had borne witness to the great utility of his father's labour in this distribution, in having with one consent embraced his father's invention, in every language into which the New Testament has been translated."‡

The testimony from the Greek Concordance is thus noticed by the learned Pritius, in his Introduction to the Greek Testament; "This most useful invention (of the distribution of chapters into verses) we owe to Robert Stephens."§ He then gives an extract from the Preface, which we shall cite from the original still more fully than Pritius has done. "Those who think that the last benefit

\* This is entitled "Biblia utriusque Testamenti; Vetus, juxta editionem vulgatam, et versionem Sanctis Pagnini cum annotationibus quæ dicuntur Vatabli; Novum secundum Vulgatam veterem, et novam Theodori Beza, cujus hæc est prima editio, 1556-1557." Dean Prideaux, as well as Chevallier and Maittaire, erroneously supposed that this was the first edition of the Bible by Stephens, which contained the figures prefixed to the verses. The New Testament was published in 1556, and the Old in 1557.

† "Veteris interpretis trālationem in interiori paginæ parte minutioribus literis excusam damus, ad vetustissima exemplaria accuratissime emendatam, versibusque, ut in Hebraicis codicibus, distinctam."

‡ "Pudebat me equidem, quum Pater meus illis toties operam et studium navasset variis Testamenti Novi editionibus . . . ac postremo illam singulorum hujus libri capitum in certum versuum numerum distributionem excogitasset, nisi et ipse symbolam meam . . . conferrem, ab illo videre degenerare. Sed magnam laboris paterni, id est, illius seu distributionis seu divisionis ab eo excogitata, esse utilitatem, universi propemodum christiani orbis in eâ amplectendâ consensus, quâcunque Testamentum Novum excuditur linguâ, satis superque testatur."

§ "Deinde capita rursus in versus distinguuntur. 'Quod quidem utilissimum inventum Roberto Stephano debemus.'"

conferred by my father on the Scriptures, or rather on the readers of Scripture, was of no less importance than the former, seem to have exhibited a sound judgment. The benefit of which I now make such honourable mention is this: that as the books of the New Testament had been divided into those sections (*tmemata*) which we call chapters, he himself divided, or rather subdivided, these sections into those *tmematia*, or smaller sections, called, by an appellation more approved by others than by him, versicles; for he preferred calling them by the Greek name *Tmematia*, or its Latin *Sectionculæ*. For he saw that the ancient name for these sections was now restricted to another use. But having said thus much of the name, I shall now speak of the thing itself. I shall set out with two facts, of which you will hesitate which most to admire. One is, that he accomplished the division of each chapter of which we are treating, while on his journey from Paris to Lyons, and indeed the greater part of it *inter equitandum*; the other, that while he thought on the matter, a short time before, almost every one said that he was raving; as if he was about to bestow his time and his labour on a matter altogether unprofitable, and which would not merely procure him no honour, but would come into derision. But, lo and behold, in spite of all their opinions in condemnation of my father's institution, the invention no sooner saw the light, than it met with universal approbation, and at the same time obtained such authority that all other editions of the New Testament, whether in Greek, Latin, or German, or in any other vernacular tongue, which did not follow this invention, were in a manner placed in the rank of unauthorized books.<sup>77\*</sup>

---

\* "Robertum Steph. parentem meum literarum bonarum bono natum esse, testati sunt multi, ac testantur quotidie quamplurimi: et omnibus tacentibus, res ipsa id clamat. Sed tam multa in sacras pariter literas (sive Heb. sive Græc. sive Lat. sive Gallico mandatas sermoni) et profanas, præstitit, ut siquis operam ab eo in unas navatam cum eâ quam in alteras navavit conferat, de utris melius meritum dicere oporteat, in dubio fortasse relicturus sit: quum alioqui nulla dubitatio de hoc relinquatur, quin de sacris melius mereri cupiverit. Ultimum autem quod in eas, vel potius in earum lectores, contulit beneficium, minus aliis non fuisse qui judicant, non insagaci esse judicio videntur. Id cujus honorificam mentionem facio beneficium, illud est, quod quum Testamenti Novi libri in *Tmemata*, quæ capita vulgo dicuntur, divisi essent, ipse horum *Tmematum* unumquodque in *Tmematia* divisit, vel potius subdivisit; quæ, appellatione ab aliis magis quam ab ipso probata, Versiculi vocata fuerunt.—Nam ipsi vel Græcâ illâ voce *Tmematia*, vel Latinâ quæ illi respondet, *Sectionculas* nominari magis placebat. Illam vero veterem commatum in oratione appellationem (Ciceronis Incisorum) ad alium restringi usum videbat. Verum, ut his paucis de nomine contentus sim, de re ipsâ plura dicam: initium a duobus sumam, quorum utrum magis mirari debeas, dubitabis. Unum est quod Lutetiâ Lugdunum petens, hanc, quâ de re agitur, capitâ cujusque catacopen confecit, et quidem magnam ejus inter equitandum partem: alterum quod illum paulo ante de hac cogitantem, plerique omnes incogitantem esse aiebant, perinde ac si in re prorsus inutili futurâ, adeoque non tantum nullam laudem consequuturâ, sed in derisum etiam venturâ, ponere tempus atque operam vellet. At ecce contra eorum damnatricem instituti patris mei opinionem, inventum illud simul in lucem, simul in omnium gratiam venit: simulque in tantam auctoritatem, ut quasi exautorarentur aliæ Testamenti Novi, sive Græcæ, sive Latine, sive Gallicæ, sive Germanicæ, sive in aliâ vernaculâ linguâ editiones, quæ inventum id secutæ non essent. Ut autem aliud ex alio venire illi in mentem solebat, quum et heuretico præditus

Serrarius also, in his Prolegomena, makes the following allusion to this circumstance, which he says that he heard from the mouth of Henry Stephens himself:—"I strongly suspect that it is far from certain who it was in our days who first *restored* the intermitted distinction into verses. Henry Stephens, indeed, having once come to Wurzburg, would fain have persuaded me that his father, Robert, was the inventor of this distinction in the New Testament, and I afterwards saw the same statement published by him in his preface to his Greek Concordance,\* with the addition that it was on his way from Paris to Lyons that he made this division, and a great part while riding on horseback (*inter equitandum*.)"

Serrarius seems not at all pleased that the honour of this invention should belong to a Protestant, for he adds, "This may, after all, be an empty boast; but supposing it to be true, as Catholics, who were actuated with the desire of sacred knowledge, have used well, and to the glory of God, the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion, who were either apostates or heretics, so may they use the division of Robert Stephens. 'The most correct notarii, said Seneca,' he significantly observes, 'were frequently to be found among the vilest slaves.'"

That there was nothing particular to boast of in this famous invention will probably occur to the reader before we conclude. Whoever was its author, the boast of its having been done with such post haste expedition as Henry Stephens described it to have been executed by his father, seems no great matter of triumph, however we are to understand the phrase *inter equitandum*. This phrase has been variously understood. According to some, it denotes that Stephens performed this

---

ingenio esset, et magna pars cogitationum ejus non alio intenta foret quam ad excogitandum quidpiam quod sacrosancti voluminis autoribus utilitatem afferret, Concordantiarum Græcarum, vel potius Græco-Latinarum, opus, qua editioni Caput unumquodque in illa Tmematia sectum habenti responderent, prævertendum aliis omnibus existimavit. Neque tamen temporis compendium, quod cum operis illius dispendio non minus quam cum parsimoniâ sordidâ conjunctum esset, querere voluit, (etiâsi in multis id operibus factitabatur, et hodie multo magis factitatur) quoddam opus, cui autor nomen Concordantiarum imposuerat, interpolatum, et accessione aliquâ accretum edendo: præsertim quum non solum multominus alicubi quam dimidium locorum partem, sed multos etiâ errores haberet; et quidem aliquos in nonnullis quoque verborum thematibus: qualis est ubi verbo *ἡβουλήθη* (quod est pro *ἐβουλήθη*) thema datur *ἀβουλέομαι*. Quid igitur parens meus? idem nimirum quod de Concordantiis Latinis Universorum Bib. consilium iniit, ut relictâ eâ quæ solum ex rivulis hauserat editione, ad ipsum fontem veniens, non pocillis, ut alii, sed magnis poculis tantum hauserit, quantum ad editionem plenarum Concordantiarum satisfaceret."—*Preface to Greek Concordance.*

\* "Et vero quis nostro isto sæculo intermissam illam distinctionem revocaret primus, quisque suos primus singulis versibus affixit numeros, ignotum etiâ suspicor. Mihi sane voluit aliquando, Herbolopolim cum venisset, persuadere Henricus Stephanus patrem suum Robertum hujus in Novo Testamento distinctionis auctorem esse, quin et id ipsum ab eo literis Latinis ante Concordantias Græcas mandatum vidi postea. De illo enim ait—'Quum Testamenti Novi libri in Tmemata quæ capita vulgo vocantur divisi essent, ipse horum Tmematum unumquodque in Tmematia divisit, vel potius subdivisit, Lutetiâ Lugdunum petens, hanc quâ de re agitur, capitibus ejusque catacopen confecit, et quidem magnam ejus inter equitandum partem.' Vana hæc potest gloriatio esse."—Quæst. xii. Mogunt. 1612.

work while riding on horseback; according to others, riding in his coach. One learned man is of opinion, as we shall presently see, that it was done during the intervals of his journey; and another, that the idea only had suggested itself to Stephens while taking his ride. Pritius adds that Pfaff was of opinion that this phrase could scarcely be understood; but Calmet goes so far as to say that the present punctuation of the New Testament was equally accomplished *inter equitandum* by Robert Stephens.\* Pritius gives as a specimen of Stephens's accuracy, Heb. xii. 21, 23, 24, where, he observes, "those parts which should have been *united*, are violently torn asunder."†

"The verses," says Michaelis, "into which the New Testament is divided, are more modern [than the *στίχοι*], and are an imitation of the division of the Old Testament. Robert Stephens, the first inventor, introduced them in his edition of 1551. He made this division on a journey from Lyons to Paris; and as his son Henry tells us in the preface to the Concordance to the New Testament, he made it *inter equitandum*. I apprehend this must mean that when he was weary of riding, he amused himself with this work at his inn. The wild and indigested invention of the learned printer was soon introduced into all the editions of the New Testament."‡

The learned Dr. Mill, the celebrated editor of the New Testament, also ascribes this invention to Robert Stephens: speaking of the edition of 1551, he observes, "This edition is remarkable for being the first of all in which the text is divided into the sections or versicles which we now use. Robert Stephens was the author of this division, which happened to *come into his mind* while riding from Paris to Lyons."§

---

\* In the Preface to his Commentary on the Bible, vol. i.; Paris, 1715, ed. 2, "The pointing," he observes, "is of uncertain authority." "The ancients," he says, "pointed differently from us. They had but a single point, by placing which at the top, middle, or bottom of a line, they marked a comma, colon, or period. In the good times of the Greek and Latin antiquities, all the words were divided by so many points. When ignorance was spread by the barbarians, punctuation was neglected. At the time of Charlemagne it was reestablished by Alcuin, and Paul son of Warnefrid. Manuscripts, since that period, are pointed with more or less accuracy, according to the abilities of the transcriber. As to printers, the Manutius's are said to be the inventors of points and commas, who inserted them in their beautiful impressions. We are assured that Robert Stephens fixed the punctuation of the New Testament, and that with so much haste, that he laboured at this work in going one day on horseback from Paris to Lyons, according to the relation of his son Henry."—"Henrici Stephani præfatio in Concordantias Græc. Lat. Novi Testamenti, Genevæ, 1594." Calmet has it 1524. The correction of these mistakes has cost us much trouble.

† "Pfaffius loc. cit. hoc vix comprehendi posse arbitratur, at enim quâ ἀκριβείᾳ ejusmodi tmematia distinxerit Robert. Stephanus exemplo esse poterit Heb. xii. 21, 23, 24, ubi ea quæ conjungi debuerant, maximâ vi invicem divelluntur."

‡ Marsh's Michaelis.

§ "Illud vero in hac Edit. palmarium est, quod in ea jam omnium prima textus distinctus sit in tmemata ea seu versiculos, quibus hodieque utimur. Hanc enim divisionem, quæ ipsi forte, cum equitando Lutetia Lugdunum peteret, in mentem venerat, jam perfecit Robertus Stephanus posuitque in hac editione," &c.—Prolegom. p. 127.



The following extracts from Chevallier's "History of Ancient Printing," which are repeated by Maittaire in his "Historia Stephano-rum," show that these two learned men were of opinion that Stephens was the author of this division, and that he had introduced it into the New Testament in 1551, and into the Old in his edition of the Latin Bible, published in 1557:—

"En l'année 1551, il réimprima le Nouveau Testament, d'une forme un peu plus grande, en deux vol. où il, &c. ; et divisa les chapitres par versets, ainsi qu'il avoit vû pratiqué dans les plus anciens manuscrits Grecs et Latins; et mit un chiffre à chaque verset pour une plus grande commodité. Ce qu'il pratiqua ensuite dans l'impression de l'Ancien Test. l'année 1557. C'est là le plus ancien Nouveau Testament, et c'est la plus ancienne Bible Latine, où j'ai vû les versets distingués par chiffres; cet exemple fût bientôt suivi. Les Ministres firent imprimer de cette manière leurs Bibles Françaises et leurs Nouveaux Testaments en différentes villes, comme à Genève, à Lyons, à Caen, à Orléans; en 1556, par Phibbert Hamelin; en 1560 et 1562, par Antoine Rébul; en 1563, par Barthelemy Molin, et la même année par Jean Crespin, et par Pierre Philippe; en 1556, par Sebastien Honorati; en 1567, par Louis Rabier, et par plusieurs autres. Les années suivantes, Nicolas Barbie et Thomas Courteau imprimèrent aussi en cette façon, l'année 1564, à Basle, la Bible Latine, selon les traductions de Pagnin et de Vatable; René Benoist fit ainsi paroître à Paris sa Bible Française, en fol. 1566. Christ. Plantin, à Anvers, acheva le Pentateuque de sa Polyglotte, en 1569, et les autres tomes en 1570, 71, 72; où se voit la distinction des versets par chiffres. A Rome la Bible de Sixte V., 1590, et celle de Clém. VIII., 1592, furent données au public en cette même manière. Et depuis Clément VIII. la Vulgate a été imprimée ordinairement par versets chiffrés, avec cette différence, que dans les Bibles et Nouveaux Testaments de Robert Estienne, des ministres de Genève et de Basle, tous les versets commencent la ligne; ce que ne se trouvent point observé dans celles de Sixte V. et de Clément VIII. si on excepte Job, les Pseaumes, et les Paraboles de Salomon. Ordinairement les Protestants ont suivis la méthode de Robert Estienne, et quelques-uns parmi les Catholiques, &c. &c. On voit, que depuis le temps de Robert Estienne, l'usage a été d'imprimer la Sainte Bible avec des chiffres Arabes à tous les versets. Jacques Fabry d'Estables les avoit déjà introduits dans son Psalterium Quintuplex, imprimé 1509 et 1513, par Henry père de Robert, &c.

"Sans doute, Robert Estienne avoit vû ces impressions, et il est bien probable, qu'il forma son idée sur ces exemples."

And again,—

"Théodore Jansson d'Almelouë dit dans son livre *De Vitâ Stephanorum*, imprimé à Amsterdam, 1683, que cet imprimeur imagina le dessein de mettre des chiffres, et de distinguer ainsi les versets du Nouveau Testament, étant à cheval dans un voyage qu'il faisoit de Paris à Lyons. 'Ipsum equitando Lutetiâ Lugdunum

dum peteret, tmemata illa seu incisa, vel ut nostri vocant, versus, per Novum Testamentum invenisse.”

It is needless to multiply proofs of this prevalent idea, which has ascribed the introduction of verses in the New Testament to Stephens. It has been repeated by every subsequent writer who has adverted to the subject.\* But the reader will not have failed to observe, that as Stephens asserts that he had introduced this division into the New Testament in imitation of Greek manuscripts, so he had introduced it into the Old in imitation of the Hebrews. The introduction of verses into the Old Testament, as well as the New, is indeed attributed to Stephens by most writers, including Du Pin, Calmet, Father Simon, and Jahn; the former† observes that “Robert Stephens was the first who followed exactly the distinction of the Masorites in his Latin Bibles;” Calmet‡ asserts that it was in his edition of 1545 that Robert Stephens first introduced this division; while Father Simon,§ in which he is followed by Jahn,|| asserts that this introduction took place in the later edition of 1548.

In Mr. Horne’s useful Introduction, into which the inaccuracies, as well as the more correct statements of the learned, have sometimes found their way, the process by which the present verses were introduced into the Bible is thus described:—

“Rabbi Mordecai Nathan undertook a similar concordance for the Hebrew Scriptures; but, instead of adopting the marginal letters of Hugo, he marked every fifth verse with a Hebrew numeral, thus, *ו. ה. ו.*, &c., retaining, however, the cardinal’s division into chapters. The introduction of verses into the Hebrew Bible was made by Athias, a Jew of Amsterdam [1661], with the figures now in use, except those which had been previously marked by Nathan with Hebrew letters, in the manner in which they at present appear in the Hebrew Bibles. By rejecting these Hebrew numerals, and substituting for them the corresponding figures, all the copies of the Bible in other languages have since been marked.” “The verses into which the New Testament is now divided are much more modern, (viz. than the *στίχοι*) and are an imitation of those invented for the Old Testament by Rabbi Nathan in the fifteenth century. Robert Stephens was their first inventor.”

We might infer from these two passages that Rabbi Mordecai Nathan was the first inventor of the present verses in the Old Testa-

\* Hug, for instance, observes, “The verses came from Robert Stephens, who first introduced them in his edition of the New Testament, in 1551. There is no mention made of the place where it was printed, but it is adorned with Stephens’s olive.”

† Prolegomena, p. 287.

‡ Preface to the Bible:—“We are assured that it is Robert Stephens, who, in his edition of 1545, has divided the text by verses, numbered as at present. This division passed from the Latins to the Greeks and Hebrews.”

§ Simon. *Histoire Critique*.

|| “Versus in Latinam Vulgatam primum a Rob. Stephano, 1548, inducti et numeris insigniti sunt.”—Jahn. *Introductio*, § 102, p. 121, Ed. 2. emendata. Viennæ, 1814. 8vo.

ment, as well as of their numerical notation, as Stephens was of those in the New; that, however, only every fifth verse was marked with a numeral letter, until the year 1661, when Athias published his edition, introducing the Arabic numerals into the Hebrew Bibles, in the manner in which they are prefixed at present; and that it was not until after this year that the copies of the Bibles in other languages were marked with these figures, in imitation of the Hebrew Bibles. It is true that in another place Mr. Horne says that the Masorites were the inventors of verses, but he does not intimate that they were the same with those now in use.

Notwithstanding the positive assertion that Stephens was the author of these divisions both in the Old and New Testament, we find Elias Levita speaking on this subject as if it were by no means an ascertained fact. "Who," he says, "can name the inventor of the mariner's compass? It is a matter of dispute who was the author of the famous art of printing. The same may be said of the telescope, for Galileo only improved it: and to come nearer to our purpose, who invented the spirits and accents, and who first affixed the points which we call the comma, colon, and period? Who first divided the books of the Old and New Testament into *στίχοι*? There are even some who entertain doubts respecting a matter but recently come into use, who the person was who first introduced the division of verses into the Greek and Latin Bibles."\*

We have already observed that the earliest authority for the received opinion that Stephens was the inventor of these verses, at least in the New Testament, is Robert Stephens himself. But notwithstanding the boastings of his son Henry, it seems to us not quite evident that Robert himself meant to take the credit, such as it was, of this invention; on the contrary, it cannot have failed to strike the attentive reader, that, so far from putting himself forward as the inventor, he even in some degree disclaims it, where he says that in his division of the Old Testament he had "followed the custom of the Hebrews,"† and in that of the New, that he "imitated the most ancient Greek and Latin manuscripts."‡

We shall therefore now proceed with the inquiry, whether any divisions corresponding to our verses existed among the Jews, and

---

\* "Quis pyxidis nauticæ primum inventorem certo nominare potest? De arte typographica, inventione præclarâ, et vix ante 200 annos in usu, disputant quisnam primus auctor. Tubi optici, sive telescopii, certus auctor ignoratur: Galilæus enim, licet illud multum excoluit, primus tamen ejus non fuit inventor. Et ut propius ad rem, de quâ agimus, accedamus, dicant nobis, quis primus spiritus et accentus libris Græcis apposuit, et tam apud Græcos quam Latinos aliosque comma, colon, et periodum earumque notas, ad distinctionem sententiæ, usurpavit? Quisnam apud antiquos, libros Novi Testamenti et quosdam Veteris in *στίχοις* primo divisit? Quin et de eo, quod nuper in usu cæptum, dubitant nonnulli, quis primus Biblia Latina et Græca per versus primo partitus sit. Videmus in iis, qui paucis abhinc annis inventa sunt, quam difficile sit authores certo designare."—See Walton's *Prolegomena*.

† Preface to the edition of the Latin Vulgate, 1555.

‡ Preface to the edition of the New Testament, Greek and Latin, 1551.

also what divisions of this description are to be found in Greek manuscripts.

But we must take care, in entering on this inquiry, to mark the distinction between divisions into sections or verses, and the enumeration of these divisions, and also between the numbering of these divisions, and the attaching of figures to them, for the sake of arithmetical notation or reference. For instance, there may have been divisions answering to our verses, both in the Hebrew and Greek Scriptures, and yet the number of these divisions may never have been added up; or there may have been divisions, without any figures attached, as in our present Bibles. And again, as our present divisions into verses are not numerical divisions of books, but merely of chapters, and as they are consequently connected intimately with the division into chapters, it will be necessary to recollect when this division into chapters took place, as it is evident that the present numerical divisions of the chapters into verses could not have been introduced, under any circumstances, before the chapters themselves were invented. This, then, must form part of our inquiry and consideration. That there has been a division of the Hebrew Bible into verses from a remote period cannot be contested, but when this division took place must, in all probability, ever remain a mystery. Only it would appear that no division of the kind existed in Jerome's time, or he would scarcely have passed it over in silence, especially as he asserts that he was himself the author of a division, which he introduced into the Latin Vulgate. The probability is, from the close connexion between the vowel points and the *soph pasuk* (soph pasuk,) which marks the present division in our Hebrew Bibles, as well as from the fact that the Masoretic copies contain this division into verses, separated from each other by the *soph pasuk*, that the Masorites were the authors of these, and that they were at least as ancient as the times of the Masorites, whose labours are supposed to have spread over a period from the fifth to the tenth century of our era; but whether these may have been, like the said vowel points, handed down traditionally from an earlier period, is a question which we shall not here stop to examine. We shall only add, that these masoretic verses, called *pesukim*, and separated from each other by the double point called *soph pasuk*, or termination of the verse, are nearly identical with the verses in our own Bibles.\*

The earliest printed edition of the Hebrew Bible, published by Bomberg in 1518, has the present division, marked with the *soph pasuk*, but without the numeral letters. These are first found in the edition of 1523, in which each fifth verse is marked with the Hebrew numerals, according to the invention of Rabbi Nathan.

There are occasional exceptions, as, for instance, 1 Kings 4, which has in the common copies thirty-four, but in Athias only

\* See Walton's Prolegomena, viii. § 1—12. Ludov. Capell. Crit. Sac. t. ii. c. 12, also 13 cap. 17, Buxtorf's Tiberias, cap. viii. and Tract. Megilla, c. 3, fol. 22.

twenty verses. Athias says that he followed a very ancient manuscript. Also Gen. vii. 22 is in some MSS. the first verse of the ninth chapter. But "in what way," to use the words of the learned Pareau, "the present division into verses found its way into the Hebrew Bibles it is impossible to say with any certainty."

We now come to the consideration of the Greek manuscripts, which Stephens, in his preface to his edition of 1551, asserts that he followed. It therefore becomes necessary to inquire, what kind of verses were used by the Greeks.

Some division of this kind has been supposed to be of very early date. Eusebius considers it to have been first used by Origen in his Hexapla. Hesychius, who died in the year 433, and is supposed to have been a disciple of Gregory Nazianzen, published a work, which he entitled the *Στιχηρεῖς* of the Twelve Prophets, or the prophetic books divided into *στίχοι*, that is, verses, or rather lines. He informs us, at the same time, that this manner of writing was peculiar to the poetical books, that is to say, the book of Job, the Psalms, and the works of Solomon; but at the same time asserts, that he had found a similar division in the apostolical books; and it would appear that this kind of writing by *στίχοι* was afterwards transferred, for greater perspicuity, to the writings of the Prophets. He\* considers this kind of writing at least as ancient as the time of David and Solomon. Eusebius is our authority for asserting, that Origen used this method in his Hexapla, dividing the Greek and other versions into *κῶλα*.† Jerome acquaints us that the books of Job, Canticles, and Ecclesiastes had been already so written;‡ and there exist Hebrew manuscripts, in which these books, together with the other poetical books, are divided into stanzas and hemistichs. The nature of the subject, and especially the parallelism of the sentences, which forms such a peculiarity of Hebrew poetry, seem to require some such division, which may have proceeded from the original authors, and been transferred from the Hebrew to the Septuagint.

Jerome says that it was to prevent confusion, amid so many proper names, that he introduced this division into the books of Chronicles,§ which he thus distinguished into colons and commas; but it does

\* *ἔστι μὲν ἀρχαῖον τοῦτο τοῖς θεοφόροις τὸ σπουδαίον, στίχων ὡς τὰ πολλὰ πρὸς τὴν τῶν μελετωμένων σαφήνειαν, τῆς προφητείας ἐκτίθεσθαι, κ. τ. λ.*—Hesychius. "It was an ancient invention of the holy fathers, for the sake of greater perspicuity, to divide the prophetic books into colons or members of verses, for they were at first written without any distinction. But it was afterwards so introduced by the learned. The books of the Prophets were thus edited by them: also the Psalms of David, the Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Solomon's Song. The book of Job is also thus found; and I have myself found the book of the Apostles" (the Acts and Epistles) "divided by some in the same manner."

† Eusebius, Hist. Eccles. b. vi. c. 16. Bishop Christopherson, however, the translator of Eusebius, was of opinion that these *κῶλα* were the columns into which Origen divided his Hexapla.

‡ See Jerome's Preface to Isaiah and Ezekiel.

§ See his Second Apology to Ruffinus, and his Preface to Joshua, Isaiah, and Ezekiel.

not appear that he introduced a similar division into the other books of Scripture. Martianay is of opinion, that it was in imitation of Jerome, that Hesychius divided the twelve minor prophets into *στίχοι*, which Hesychius himself says had been previously done in regard to the metrical or poetical books, which are also called *στιχηρεῖς* by Gregory Nazianzen,\* Amphilochius,† Polychronius,‡ (who says that they are metrically written in Hebrew,) and John of Damascus. Epiphanius§ also, in his Fourth Catechesis, gives the name of the five *στιχηρεῖς*, or stichometrical books, to Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and the Canticles, to which he adds Jesus Sirach.

Hesychius, as we have already seen, asserts that the prophetic books had been originally written without any distinction into verses; but that the holy Fathers had adopted the division for the sake of perspicuity. It is probable that he here alludes not to the Hebrew, but the Greek. It is here observable, that the word used by Hesychius is *στίχος*; and as it is of importance to our inquiry to examine into the sense of this word, we shall here enter briefly on this consideration. The word *στίχος* seems to be synonymous with the Latin *versus*, which is used by the Latin writers in exactly the same sense. The word *στίχος* seems, however, not to have been always used in precisely the same signification. It sometimes seems to denote a short sentence; at other times, one or two words regulated by the sense, but filling only a part of the line, the rest being left blank; a portion, in fact, in which there was any meaning whatever, although imperfect and but commenced. It sometimes signified a whole sentence, as in the following example from Demosthenes's *Oratio pro Coronâ*, given by Aquila Romanus: οὐκ εἶπον μὲν οὖν ταῦτα, οὐκ ἔγραφα δὲ οὐδὲ ἔγραφα μὲν, οὐκ ἐπρέσβευσα δὲ οὐδὲ ἐπρέσβευσα μὲν, οὐκ ἔπειτα δὲ θηβαίοις; but it more usually signified a line, consisting generally of the same number of words without any reference to the sense, for the greater facility of counting the number of lines. Most existing manuscripts of the *στιχηρεῖς*, which are copies of stichometrical books, are, however, written in a continued text, with the divisions marked with points, in order to save parchment. The following examples of stichometry will here serve to illustrate our subject.

The verse in Job, "Perish the day," is thus stichometrically divided in the Thecla or Alexandrine MS. (A):

Ἀπόλοιτο ἡ ἡμέρα, ἐν ᾗ ἐγεννήθην ἐν αὐτῇ  
καὶ ἡ νύξ ἐν ᾗ εἶπον Ἴδού ὤρσεν.

So also in the words, which in the Hebrew text make but one verse, it has been found thus:

Ἀπενέγκοιτο αὐτὴν σκότος. Μὴ εἴη εἰς  
ἡμέρας ἐνιαυτοῦ, μηδὲ ἀριθμηθεῖη εἰς ἡμέρας μηνῶν.

\* Carm. 33.

† Carm. ad Seleucum.

‡ Prolegomena in Job.

§ Lib. iv. de Orth. Fid.



But in A, it is thus divided :

Ἀπενύγκοιτο . . . . .  
μὴ εἶη . . . . .  
μηδὲ ἀριθμηθεῖν . . . . .

Again, the 13th verse of the fifth chapter is divided into eight verses in the same manuscript.

The following will serve as an example of stichometry, taken from a Greek manuscript of the seventh century. We shall, however, give it in English, according to the authorized version.

Rom. vi. 19—22. . . . .

Because of the infirmity  
of your flesh  
For as ye have yielded  
your members  
servants to uncleanness  
and to iniquity unto iniquity  
Even so now yield  
your members  
servants to righteousness  
unto holiness

What fruit had ye then in those things  
whereof ye are now ashamed  
For the end of those things  
is death  
But now being made free from sin  
and become servants of God  
Ye have your fruit unto holiness  
and the end everlasting life.

The two first of these lines are said by Montfaucon to belong to the former period. The next period has eight *στίχοι* or lines. This contains two colons, each having four commas or versicles. This learned writer says that each colon contained two sections. As he informs us that these divisions supply the place of points throughout the manuscript, it would seem more properly to belong to the Euthalian division, which we shall next refer to.

It appears from what Hesychius has said of his seeing a stichometrical copy of the Acts and Epistles, that stichometry had been then some time in use. There was, however, another sort of stichometry invented in the fifth century by Euthalius the deacon (of Alexandria), which was a rude substitute for the art of punctuation. The following example is taken from Wetstein's uncial manuscript, H, Titus ii. 2, 3:—

πρεσβύτεας νηφαλίους εἶναι  
σεμνοὺς  
σώφρονας  
ὕψαινοντας τῇ πίστει  
τῇ ἀγάπῃ,  
. . . . .

That the aged men be sober  
grave  
temperate  
sound in faith  
in charity  
. . . . .

πρεσβυτιδας ὡσαύτως ἐν  
καταστήματι ἱεροπρεπέις

μὴ διαβόλους  
μὴ οἶνω πολλῷ δεδουλωμένας  
καλοδιδασκάλους.

The aged women likewise  
that they be in behaviour as be-  
cometh holiness  
not false accusers  
not given to much wine  
teachers of good things.

Euthalius thus completed the whole of Paul's Epistles in the year 462, and divided in the same manner the Acts and Catholic Epistles; but his stichometrical edition of the Gospels has not come down to us.\* But since his time, we have abundance of stichometrical manuscripts. Some are of opinion, that he took his idea from the stichometrical arrangement of Job, the Psalms, Proverbs, and Ecclesiastes. This mode of writing was, no doubt, of the greatest use to the unlearned, and assisted them in discovering the sense of what they read, in the absence of points. This work came out under the patronage of Nicephorus, patriarch of Constantinople, to whom the work was dedicated.

Although several of the transcripts of these stichometrical manuscripts have not preserved the stichometrical form, they yet continue to enumerate the *στίχοι* at the end of each book. They sometimes also add the number of *ῥήματα*; but what this signified is doubtful. It is, however, certain, that there was nearly the same number of *ῥήματα* as of *στίχοι*.†

After this, the practice commenced of saving expense, by filling up the entire of the vacant space; and points were used, for the purpose of showing where each separate verse ended. Thus, instead of writing—

ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς, παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον·  
καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ·  
ἀκούσας δὲ ὅτι Ἀρχέλαος βασιλεύει ἐπὶ τῆς Ἰουδαίας·  
ἀντὶ Ἡρώδου, τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ·  
ἐφοβήθη ἐκεῖ ἀπελθεῖν·  
χρηματισθεὶς δὲ· κ. τ. λ. — Matt. ii. 21, 22.

They wrote thus—

ὁ δὲ ἐγερθεὶς· παρέλαβε τὸ παιδίον· καὶ τὴν μητέρα αὐτοῦ· καὶ ἦλθεν εἰς γῆν Ἰσραὴλ· ἀκούσας δὲ, κ. τ. λ.

The Alexandrian manuscript (A) in the British Museum is a *copy* of a stichometrical MS. in which the close of each *στίχος* is marked by a point, as—

καὶ εἶδον τὰ τετράποδα τῆς γῆς· καὶ τὰ θηρία καὶ τὰ ἑρπετὰ· καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ· ἤκουσα δὲ φωνῆς λεγούσης μοι· ἀναστὰς Πίτερ· θύσον καὶ φάγε.

But there are other marks, which prove it to have been altogether independent of Euthalius's invention, and to have been written, together with other uncial manuscripts, including the Codex Ephremi,

\* Hug seems to think it possible, that Euthalius executed no stichometrical arrangement of the Gospels; and that whoever did, might have called the *στίχοι*, *ῥήματα*. Of these *στίχοι*, it was usual to give the number at the end of each book. They were sometimes also numbered in the margin, as we shall see hereafter.

† Bishop Marsh, no mean authority, seems decidedly of opinion, that *στίχοι* were lines only, without any reference to the sense, while *ῥήματα* were short sentences.

and Dr. Barrett's manuscript of St. Matthew's Gospel, (which shall be hereafter referred to,) before the system of stichometry came into repute.

The celebrated Codex Bezae is a stichometrical manuscript, but the number of verses is not added at the end. Another stichometrical manuscript, the Codex Laudianus E, has preserved the numbers. This contains the stichi both in Greek and Latin, in opposite columns, as does also the uncial MS. D, or the Clermont MS. in the French king's library.

The uncial MS. G, or the Codex Boernerianus, a manuscript written by an Irishman in the ninth century, and once in the possession of the famous John Scotus, (or the Irishman,) is also copied from a stichometrical exemplar, and the writing of the present MS. is continuous, and the commencement of each verse merely indicated by a capital initial. The following example is (incorrectly) given by Hug, as a proof that the transcriber was an ignorant man, and incapable of planning a few *στίχοι* on Euthalius's principles.

Ταῦτά σοι γράφω ἐλπίζω ἐλθεῖν τάχειν  
 Ἐάν βραδύνα ἵνα ἰδῇς  
 Πῶς δεῖ . ἐν οἴκῳ Θεοῦ ἀναστρέφεται.  
 Ἦτις ἐστὶν ἐκκλησία Θεοῦ ζώντος  
 Στύλος καὶ ἰδραῖωμα τῆς ἀληθείας  
 Καὶ ὁμολογουμένως . μέγα ἐστὶν τὸ τῆς εὐσεβίας . μυστήριον  
 Ὅς ἐφαναρώθη . ἐν σαρκί.  
 Ἐδικαιώθη ἐν Πνεύματι  
 Ὡφθη ἀγγέλοις  
 Ἐκηρύχθη ἐν . ἔθνεσιν  
 Πιστεύθη . ἐν κόσμῳ  
 Ἀνελήφθη ἐν δόξῃ.  
 Ὁ δὲ πνεῦμα ῥητῶς λέγει  
 Ὅτι ἐν ὑστέροις καιροῖς \*

The unsatisfactory nature of this kind of stichometrical pause led to attempts at grammatical improvement, which ended in our present system of punctuation, which was introduced probably about the eighth century, and brought to its present state of perfection before the tenth.†

It will be now evident to the reader, that when Stephens said that he had followed ancient Greek manuscripts in his division of the verses, he could not possibly have referred to the ancient system of stichometry:—Stephens has, consequently, been accused of having made this statement to serve a purpose. But as this will form a subsequent part of our inquiry, we shall next give some account of the divisions to be found in the ancient Latin manuscripts.

(To be continued.)

\* The Greek characters are like those in the Psalter of Sedulius the Irishman, in Moutfaucou's Palæog. Græc. l. iii. c. 7, p. 237, which we shall hereafter notice. The Latin is Antehieronymian. The character is Irish. We have corrected some errors in Hug's stichometrical arrangement of this passage by a comparison with the original.

† Cassiodorus strongly recommends the use of points to those who copy the Sacred Scriptures, urging that they serve, in some respects, the purpose of an explanation. "Istæ siquidem posituræ sive puncta, quasi quidem viæ sunt sensuum et lumina dictionum." He attributes them to St. Jerome as the author.

## NOTICES OF BOOKS.

*Memoir of the Life of Richard Phillips.* London: Seeley & Burnside. 1841. 8vo. Pp. 292.

THE subject of this memoir was one of "the persons called Quakers," and his son is his biographer. Mr. Phillips appears to have enjoyed in the religious world of his day a place of some eminence, his claims to which we will not dispute; neither do we doubt that he was a man of earnest piety. At present we content ourselves with quoting a few short passages, which may illustrate the state of religious feeling among "the Friends."

"Being at one time much tried and distressed by the prevalence of numerous scruples, directed or permitted with the gracious design of reducing and rendering more subservient the obstinate will of man—opposed, as it naturally is, to the real Cross; in a kind of almost despair of obtaining any relief from their pressure and subsequent recurrence, in anguish I hastily exclaimed, 'Why is it thus? I will follow thee even to the gallows.' Upon which a sudden flash of light, similar to lightning, passed before me, as into the ground, when these scruples in a very considerable degree ceased. How wonderful and merciful are the ways of the Most High! who thus, by what may be termed things that are not, brings to naught things that are!" . . . . . "I know an individual who was so dismayed and terrified by an impression on his mind, requiring him to do a particular act, that he hastily resolved that, should such a requisition be repeated, he would, sooner than comply therewith or submit thereto, sacrifice his life: yet, some years later, his mind having been greatly exercised, humbled, and reduced, by the operations of these foolish, despised things, and even by things that are not; on the requiring before alluded to being repeated, he submitted thereto, and had to participate of the sustaining and encouraging fruits of obedience."

These are the words of Phillips the elder; on which his son's comment is as follows: "It now remains for me to raise the veil a little more from these facts, and in so doing, I believe, that I follow my precious father's own advice in the extract which I have just copied. The individual whom he mentions as determining to sacrifice his life rather than comply with the requisition of duty which was impressed upon his mind, was himself. It was at a meeting, in which he felt that he ought to communicate something: and, the effect was so terrific to him, that he eventually resolved, that 'if ever that was repeated, he would *jump into the Thames*.' I believe I quote the expressions which he used in relating the occurrence to me."

It is satisfactory to know, that after all these purposes of self-immolation, the Quaker preserved a whole skin, and died peaceably at a good old age. The reader will not have failed in this passage to observe the singularity of the expression used both by father and son. In part, no doubt, it is the result of sheer affectation, as we shall presently see more at large; but it is to be observed, that there is "method in this madness," and many of the terms which they use are catholic terms, fresh struck in the sectarian mint, in order to conceal their denial of those Christian doctrines which the terms properly denote.

We have also a very peculiar use of the word "Seed," as applied to Christ, as in the following mysterious places:—

"Doubting and discouragement had nearly prevented our going: however we went, and, as yet, have not seen any cause to regret; for although (speaking to a small degree compared with many) bonds and afflictions awaited us, yet when the allotted portion of suffering was borne, the bonds were broken, and the *Seed* reigned in a degree of the Father's strength. . . . The more the state of our Society opens in these parts [South Wales], the more clearly it appears that the more the living members dwell with the *Royal Seed*, the deeper they will have to dwell, and the more intimate the union, the closer fellowship will they have with suffering."

"While musing one morning in my chamber, after having read the creed of William Cowper, in one of his letters, my mind was very unexpectedly exercised in an unusual manner, which seemed speedily to occupy my whole mind, to the exclusion of all other thoughts, and to possess it under a feeling of solemn, humble silence; when suddenly there appeared, seated before me, at a short distance on my left, my unutterable merciful heavenly Father; and a little further off, on my right, my very precious, beloved Saviour. I then felt urged in my mind to go towards them; and also pressure, as if pushed forward. On approaching to, and when near my merciful, beneficent Father, I felt a reluctance and fear to go forward; but when near to my dear Father, I felt such an increased degree of strength and animation as encouraged and enabled me to look towards him; and at the same time pointing with my right hand (which seemed peculiarly strengthened) towards my dear Saviour, I exclaimed, 'There's my Advocate!' upon which all fear ceased, and the vision immediately vanished; but was very soon succeeded by such a sweet, pure, unmixed feeling of peace (except the consciousness that in this state of being such a feeling could not long continue) that not any language is competent fully to describe it. To the best of my recollection, this state of mind remained for about three quarters of an hour."

We do not extract this passage, or the former one of the same nature, for purposes of ridicule—God forbid; but with a view of illustrating the state of religious feeling among this class of separatists; and we can unfeignedly say, that we rejoice to find that there existed a man amongst them so lately whose mind had so far escaped the general worldly leaven which has pervaded them, as to believe at all in spiritual impressions, however enthusiastic or erroneous. We shall conclude with one more short extract, which *may* allowably create a smile:—

"In the course of his gradual decay, my father's mind recurred with yearning thoughts to sacred music, as a sweet and soothing means of diminishing his sufferings and calming his spirits. He did not, however, permit himself to yield to the wish, until after diligent examination of the subject, he felt thoroughly persuaded in his own mind that he was permitted, without offending his conscience, to do so. When my dear father's decision was formed, he procured a large barrel-organ, with only sacred tunes upon it; and very greatly did he enjoy it during the last eight months of his precious life. He frequently expressed his thankfulness, that having made a sacrifice of this gratification in early life, he was now permitted to resume it, in a guarded form, in old age; he did, indeed, often experience it to be,

'Like David's harp of solemn sound,'

of real service to his spirit. At times he liked that those of his little household, who were able, should unite their voices to its swelling notes, in singing a hymn; but not unfrequently he appeared to use the tones of it merely to wing his thoughts to those regions whither his soul stood waiting to depart."

We rejoice that the old man could settle the matter so satisfactorily between his "mind" and his "conscience," as to become reconciled to the proscribed instrument. Concerning the divisions which it is well known are rending the Society of the Quakers to their foundation, this book preserves a prudent silence. Mention is made of a

"brightness" which has long since set; we read of Quakers, who both in their "dress and their address" had departed from the pristine rule; and a lax Friend who had made an exchange of hats, is twitted with having "taken his (R. P's.) *umbrella*, and having left his own *mushroom*" in its place. We do not remember any other allusions in the volume, even to laxity of discipline—none as to divisions in doctrine. In these points, the editor has no doubt "exercised himself by silence:" he would "sooner jump into the Thames" than "communicate" anything so injurious to the credit of his Society.

---

*The History of Egypt under the Romans.* By SAMUEL SHARPE. London: Moxon. 1842. 8vo. Pp. 276.

MR. Sharpe meets us in the two departments of literature, which we consider most properly to fall within our province—theology and scholarship. In the latter department, the margin of his book shows (we have not had time to consult the originals) a copious list of references; but the theology is decidedly heretical in the most capital of all points, the divinity of Jesus Christ. Whether the author be avowedly a Socinian or Unitarian we know not; the opinion which we have just given is derived solely from the internal evidence contained in this work; and therefore we think it right to show that we are not speaking at random when we bring so grave an accusation against him. His words are these:—

"*Jesus of Nazareth* was acknowledged by Constantine as a God or divine person, and in the attempt then made by the Alexandrians to arrive at a more exact definition of his nature, while the emperor was willing to be guided by the bishops in his theological opinions, he was able to instruct them all in the *more valuable* lessons of mutual toleration and forbearance. . . . The schools of Alexandria now gave birth to a quarrel about the nature of Jesus, which has divided the christian world for fifteen centuries. Theologians have found it difficult to determine what the immediate successors of the apostles and early writers thought about the exact nature of the great Founder of our religion. As it had never been brought to a logical dispute to be settled by argument or authority, the writers had not expressed their opinions in those exact terms which are so carefully used after a controversy has arisen. THE CHRISTIANS WHO HAD BEEN BORN JEWS BELIEVED THAT JESUS WAS A MAN, the Messiah foretold in the Old Testament: with the philosophical Greeks he was the divine Wisdom, the Platonic Logos; and with the Egyptians he was one out of several *Æons* or powers proceeding from the Deity. Clemens Romanus only calls him our high priest and master, phrases which Photius, in the ninth century, thought little short of blasphemy: but the philosopher Justin Martyr, and after him Clemens Alexandrinus, speak of Jesus as a God in a human form. Dionysius, Bishop of Alexandria, when arguing against Sabellius, says, that our Lord was the first-born of every created being; but as Origen writes against the practice of addressing prayers to him, many Christians must have already considered him as the disposer or one of the disposers of all human events. But these inexact opinions did not satisfy that school which united the superstition of the Egyptians with the more refined speculations of the new Platonists; and as soon as the quarrel with the pagans ceased, we find the Christians of Egypt and Alexandria divided into two parties, on the question whether the Son is of the same substance, or only of a similar substance with the Father."

We have been too long used to the sneers of Gibbon's sceptical school of writers to be much moved by expressions, which, in a spirit contrary to that of Scripture, speak of peace as "more valuable" than truth; and place heresy on a par with "the faith once delivered to the saints." But there are so many positive falsehoods, some very



subtily stated, in this extract, that they demand something of a specific notice. 1. The first falsehood, viz. that it is "difficult to determine" what doctrine the earliest writers held, is only to be refuted by referring the reader to Bishop Bull's triumphant "*Defensio Fidei*," or to the late Dr Burton's "*Testimonies of the Ante-Nicene Fathers to the Divinity of Christ*." 2. The assertion that "the Christians who had been born Jews believed that Jesus was a man," can be met more summarily. St. Peter, we believe, has always been considered as "born a Jew;" and he said to his Master, "Thou art the Christ, the Son of the living God." 3. Clemens Romanus, so far from "only" calling Jesus his "high priest and master," calls him also "the sceptre of the majesty of God," and "the brightness of his majesty." In the authors already referred to, and in Routh's "*Reliquiæ Sacræ*," will be found additional testimony from this writer. But why, Mr. Sharpe, leave out Barnabas and Hermas, and especially Ignatius, from your list? The last-named contains expressions not less strong than "Photius in the ninth century." 4. If Mr. Sharpe really thinks, as he insinuates, that Dionysius of Alexandria was led to admit the distinct divine personality of Christ in intemperate zeal against Sabellianism, the following passage will show that he maintained the unity of the divine nature in the three Persons of the Godhead as firmly as the most orthodox Catholic: speaking of the Father's will, which Christ declared that he came upon earth to fulfil, Dionysius writes, that "with respect to the divine nature, it is one will, his own and the Father's." Lastly, in order to make Origen serve his purpose, Mr. Sharpe refers *generally* to his treatise "*De Oratione*." To this we reply, that the genuineness of this treatise (see Note in "*Def. Fid.*") has been strongly questioned, amongst other reasons on this very satisfactory one, that it contains *several* doctrines at variance with what is contained in the acknowledged writings of Origen. What his real sentiments are upon this subject will appear by this extract from his book, "*Contra Celsum*:" "As those who worship the sun, moon, and stars, because of their sensible heavenly light, would not worship a spark of fire or an earthly lamp, as seeing the incomparable excellency of what they thought worthy to be worshipped above that of sparks or lamps; so they who perceive that God is Light,—they who apprehend that the Son of God is the true Light, that lighteth every man that cometh into the world,—they who understand that this Light saith, 'I am the Light of the world,'—cannot rationally worship that small spark of true light, compared to God the Light, which is in the sun, moon, and stars. Nor do we dishonour these so great works of God, or with Anaxagoras call the sun a 'ball of fire, &c.' and therefore speak of them in this manner; but we speak thus of them, perceiving the unspeakable excellences of God the Supreme, and of the Only-Begotten, who excels every thing else."

To refute the heresy of the Unitarian at this time of day, would be, indeed, a work of supererogation. Had Mr. Sharpe avowed himself such, we should not have noticed his misstatements; but it is because he appeared to us to be fighting dishonestly, under false colours, that we have been induced to strip off the mask from him. When a man excommunicates himself from the Church of Christ by a voluntary act

of deliberate heresy or schism, he is bound, we think, in candour, to advertise all such as are likely to come in contact with him of the circumstance.

1. *Letters on the Study of Ancient and Modern History; containing Observations and Reflections on the Causes and Consequences of those Events which have produced conspicuous Changes in the Aspect of the World, and the general State of Human Affairs.* By JOHN BIGLAND. 7th Edition. London: Longman & Co. 1840. 12mo. pp. 450.
2. *Rudiments of Geography.* By W. C. WOODBRIDGE, M. A. London: Whitaker.
3. *Biographical Conversations on the most Eminent and Instructive British Characters.* By the Rev. W. BINGLEY, M.A. F.L.S., late of Peterhouse, Cambridge, Author of "*Animal Biography*." Designed for the Use of Schools. London: Harvey & Darton.

WE put these three volumes together, as presenting a fair, yet favourable specimen of the class of books which, for the last fifty years, have had undisputed possession of our schools; and which, being now the property of "the Trade," continue to enjoy a very extensive sale. They are written most of them by members of the Church, and some grace the catalogue of the Society for Promoting Christian Knowledge, but they are marked by so independent and undisciplined a tone, that we wonder how any Churchman can suffer them in his family. They begin uniformly with manifesting a great contempt for all standard historians and writers. "The most uninteresting narratives of battles and sieges, (writes Mr. John Bigland,) of desolation and carnage, a thousand times repeated, and swelled with a long train of ill-authenticated, and often merely ideal circumstances, may amuse vulgar minds, but can afford little entertainment to an intelligent reader, whose ideas are more enlarged, and who desires to form a comprehensive view of things. The inquisitive mind, desirous of drawing from history a true picture of human existence, contemplates the origin and progress of the arts and sciences, of systems and opinions, and of civilization and commerce; in fine, of the whole mass of human improvements, and the progressive advancement of society." Now, who is it that dogmatizes so superciliously? We shall not err, probably, in stating that this great philosopher never read a word of either of the great historians of Greece. It is certain that he can not have understood them, or he would know that Thucydides is still a model for the philosophical historian, and that the simple narrative of Herodotus conveys a more lively representation of the actual state of manners and society in the several countries which he describes than any subsequent writer has succeeded in doing; and as for weighing the merits of controverted questions, there is not, from the beginning to the end of the "*Letters*," a single reference to original sources. Or to whom is Mr. Bigland writing when he labours to depreciate all previous authors? Were he writing to a society of critics there might be some propriety in such remarks—provided they were true; but surely for children a sentiment of contempt for authorities is the

very last feeling that a judicious person would desire to implant in their minds. The same tone of self-complacency runs throughout Bingley; who, by the way, commences his catalogue of "Divines" with Wicliffe, and ends with Paley, having included in it Watts and Doddridge.

Theology, indeed, is the great stumbling-block with all writers of this class. Thus Mr. Woodbridge, M.A. describes the state of Christendom at this time:—"There are three great divisions of Christians—Catholic, Greek, and Protestant Christians, each having peculiar doctrines and modes of worship." . . . Protestants are divided into various sects, of which the principal are Lutherans, Episcopalians, (or the Established Church of England,) Presbyterians, Independents, Baptists, Methodists, Friends or Quakers." Mr. Bingley states it as the peculiar merit of John Howard, that "his attendance at the church and the meeting-house was equally regular." Mr. Bigland considers the anathemas of the council of Nice no less horrible than the persecutions of the Pagan emperors. The real cause, of course, why writers of this stamp always adopt the latitudinarian view, is that, being used to act themselves on petty, selfish motives, they measure others by that standard. They cannot understand how a man can be zealous for abstract truth; they assume the existence of some private ends, (which, of course, the very title of "catholic" excludes,) and from those premises conclude, logically enough, that no man has a right to control his neighbour's belief. Their conclusion is rightly deduced from the premises; but the premises are false.

We make these remarks with the view of drawing the attention of those whom it may concern—of parents and schoolmasters especially—to the mischievous principles which they are daily sanctioning and propagating; and, till "the Trade" are made to feel that people have some little regard for the truth, they will not care to improve a class of books which affords them a sure and regular income. For example, why does not "the Trade" expunge the modern and unsafe definitions of doctrinal terms which are found in Cruden's "Concordance?" A single uneducated pennyless Scotch dissenting adventurer has been allowed, for about a century, to insult the whole Church with his false doctrine. It is probable that every Clergyman, from the Archbishop of Canterbury downwards, possesses the book; and yet no protest has ever been made against its unsoundness.

---

*The Latin Poems, commonly attributed to Walter Mapes, Collected and Edited by THOMAS WRIGHT, M.A. F.S.A., &c. London: Printed for the Camden Society. 1841.*

EVERY one who is at all conversant with the relics of the twelfth and thirteenth centuries, is well aware of the existence of a large class of poems in Latin verse, remarkable for their blasphemy, their licentiousness, and their falsehood. In that day, lived one Walter Mapes, a man of extensive learning and high ecclesiastical dignities, of whom his friend Giraldus Cambrensis relates, that he exercised his wit and exhibited his hostility against the encroachments of the Cistercians, in various satirical writings, both in prose and verse. To him, there-

fore, it has been customary to attribute all the poetical satires of the time, and more especially those which appeared under the name of Goliath. The remains of this poetry, the Camden Society's Council have thought of *sufficient interest and importance* to be collected into a volume, and have committed the editorship of it to Mr. Thomas Wright, of Trinity College, Cambridge, one of their own body. In the discharge of his duty, Mr. Wright has endeavoured to show, that not one line which he has published can with any certainty be attributed to Archdeacon Mapes. He might have spared his labour; for we have every reason to believe, that Walter Mapes, with all his satiric effusions against the monks, was a *christian gentleman*, which the writers of these verses could not have been. When this Society wasted a portion of their receipts on the publication of the "Political Songs," several of their members doubted as to the propriety of appearing to sanction by their subscriptions such gross publications under the plea of antiquarian relics. We should humbly conceive, that this last compound of blasphemy, licentiousness, and falsehood, would eradicate all hesitation on the subject. For a proof of its blasphemy, we have only to read the very first poem in the volume, the "Apocalypsis Goliathæ Episcopi," one of four hundred and forty lines, and considered by the editor of such importance and interest, as to require two English translations of it of the seventeenth century, so as to render it more intelligible to general readers. This poem is a literal parody on the Revelations, even to words; in which Pythagoras assumes the place of our Saviour, Goliath that of the apostle: the seven candlesticks are seven churches of England; the seven stars, seven prelates; the four beasts are the pope, the bishop, the archdeacon, and the dean; whilst from the opening of the seven seals is disclosed the supposed enormities of bishops, archdeacons, deans, officials, priests, pluralists, and abbots. And yet, this poem is, if possible, exceeded by another. Of the licentiousness and grossness of the entire collection, we cannot, of course, give any examples. The Society for the Suppression of Vice might well spend a few pounds in an indictment. It has always been customary for the editors of classical works, where indelicate passages occur, to abstain from all note or comment on them, and to show the utter worthlessness of them by their neglect. Such has not been the practice of Mr. Wright. At page 77, he shows the care and trouble he has expended on the poem "De Coniuge non Ducendâ," one of the most disgusting in the collection, of which he gives a French and English translation in the appendix, and the text of which, through the kindness of his friend Mr. Halliwell, he has been enabled to collate with four Oxford MSS.; whilst at page 56, where the text of the "Discipulus Goliathæ de Grisis Monachis," exhibits the most disgusting allusion to the dress of the monks, Mr. Wright has carefully collated a parallel obscenity from the "Political Songs," (of which he was also the editor,) and a further and most disgusting quotation from the "Speculum Stultorum" of Nigellus Wireker. Such is the spirit in which Mr. Wright has edited these poems.

We cannot here enter into the discussion of the exaggeration and falsehood of the accusations brought in the poems against the Clergy of the twelfth century. The best refutation is contained in the letters

of the great men of the day, especially of John of Salisbury and Peter of Blois. To these we refer such of our readers as are not afraid of old Latin letters; to such as are, we recommend an article in a far off *Quarterly*, April 1837, where the state of the Church in that century is illustrated at some length from the letters of cotemporaries. With these remarks, forced from us by the nature of the work, we leave this the last publication of the Camden Society of London.

---

*New Zealand, South Australia, and New South Wales: a Record of Recent Travels in these Colonies, &c. &c. By R. G. JAMESON, Esq., late Surgeon-Superintendent of Emigrants to South Australia. Smith and Elder. 1842.*

THIS is an altogether manly and pleasant book. Mr. Jameson has the happiest temperament for a traveller,—sober expectations,—cheerful enjoyment of things present,—and good humour with all around him. His lore seems to lie mainly in the directions most suited to his profession, and to the traveller in uncivilized regions—natural history and the kindred studies. To these he adds a shrewd insight into statistics and business, and sprinkles the whole with many more literary associations than we often find in the votaries of such pursuits. The part of his volume which treats of New Zealand will for every reason excite greater interest than that which is devoted to New Holland; nevertheless, the latter is worthy of a careful reading. In justice to the inhabitants of Sydney, Mr. Jameson's vindication of society there from the charge of moral degradation, so apt to be believed, (in which, be it observed, he is backed by the authority of the Bishop of Australia,) ought to be attended to. Our author writes in a tone of uniform right feeling on moral and religious matters, though ignorant, we suspect, of true Church principles. We cordially recommend this book.

---

*The Martyr of Erromanga; or the Philosophy of Missions. By JOHN CAMPBELL, D.D. London: Snow. 8vo. Pp. 470.*

"THE Martyr of Erromanga," be it known unto our readers, is one Mr. John Williams, who, being "deeply convinced by the Rev. Timothy East, in the Tabernacle, Moorfields, of sin, of righteousness, and judgment," sallied forth with great vigour to the conversion of the South-Sea Islanders, and perished in a tumult at the place above named, in the New Hebrides. Concerning one so zealous in his purpose and so single-minded we would not desire to utter a disrespectful word. Our object, indeed, is not to rob him of the glories of martyrdom, but to protest against the more than heathen inhumanity with which Dr. Campbell has disinterred his peaceful remains, in order to embalm them (we suppose, in his ignorance, he conceives) with some of the most senseless and extravagant bombast we ever read. The volume is composed of a series of letters, the first of which is addressed to "the Teachers of British and other Day-Schools;" the last to "Field-Marshal the Duke of Wellington," whom the

author considers to be the last great warrior whom the world will ever witness, since the "missionary character" is now fast superseding the "military!" This is Dr. Campbell's "Philosophy of Missions," (than which there certainly never was a greater misnomer for a book, for there is not so much as a single general principle attempted to be established throughout the volume;) and he concludes, after a lengthened comparison, by showing that Alexander the Great, Cæsar, and Napoleon, were fools to John Williams!

Brief Memorials of the Rev. B. W. Mathias, late minister of Bethesda Chapel, Dublin, (Dublin, Curry, 1842,) will be read with interest by those who remember the unction and eloquence of their subject. He seems to have been a man of deep piety, but deplorably ignorant on many important matters. In all the correspondence given we do not just now recollect a single instance of the Church in Ireland ever receiving that designation. It is throughout styled *the Establishment*; and, indeed, Mr. Mathias and his friends do not seem to have *rejected* the true doctrine of the Church, for there is no indication of its having ever so much as occurred to them.

A Letter has been addressed by the Rev. H. Mackenzie to William Lyall, Esq. suggesting the formation of "A Marine College, for the advancement of Navigation as a Science, and Improvement of the efficiency of the Merchant Marine of Great Britain." (Smith and Elder, 1841.) We cannot pretend to a positive opinion on such a matter, but the suggestion seems an important one.

"The Kings of the East; an Exposition of the Prophecies determining, &c. the Power for whom the Mystical Euphrates is being 'dried up,' &c." (Seeley and Burnside, 1842.) This is a book which, as may be seen from the title-page, treats of subjects on which we pass no opinion. For the same reason we must decline saying anything one way or other about "Israel in China," by Joseph Wright. (Nisbet, 1842.)

"Narrative of a recent Imprisonment in China," &c., by John Lee Scott, (Dalton, 1841,) is sure to be read with interest. The curious in sufferings which they are not themselves compelled to undergo, will here find a more than ordinarily ample and delicate repast. For genuine unalloyed discomfort, commend us to the interior of a Chinese cage.

"Verses by a Poor Man" are now published in one volume. (Painter, 1842.) They are dedicated by permission to Prince Albert, and have received one or two additions. Our readers know the high estimate we have formed of them.

A "Serious Remonstrance" has been addressed to the Rev. R. W. Sibthorp, B.D., on his recent publication, "by those of the Hull Clergy who were personally known to him." (Seeley, 1842.) The pamphlet is marked by a pious spirit and by a good deal of intelligence; but the reverend writers advance one or two opinions which we deeply regret ever to find emanating from any of their order, and which are more likely to fortify Mr. Sibthorp in his present position than their sounder arguments are to dislodge him from it.

"Observations on the Book of Ruth," &c., by the Rev. H. B. Macartney, rector of Creagh. (Dublin, Curry, 1842.) This author is, we doubt not, a man of piety; but either he or the Romanists he describes, p. 27, must be strangely ignorant of the doctrines of the Romish Church, and we suspect the former to be the case. How can an Irish rector justify himself in going without an accurate conception of the enemy by whom he is environed?



"Hope's British Monthly Magazine," &c. (Nisbet & Co. Berners Street,) is the designation of a periodical which has just been started, devoted to the Scottish presbyterian cause of non-intrusion. We have only seen the February number, and wish to see no other. We will not do the leading ministers on that side of the question in Scotland such injustice as to believe them capable of approving of anything so disgraceful. It is due to the respectable publisher to say that he prefixes a disclaimer of any responsibility for the contents. The writers have yet to learn English grammar, good taste, divinity, and a christian spirit.

We rejoice to see that Ireland is at length about to do justice to the greatest of her scholars, in the publication of a complete edition of Archbishop Ussher's works. The editorship is undertaken by Dr. Elrington, who, we are sure, will regard it as a labour of love. Three volumes are out.

Mr. Tegg announces a new and cheap edition of Patrick, Lowth, Arnold, Whitby, and Lowman's most valuable Commentary on the Bible, in 4 vols, imperial 8vo. In this edition the text is given as well as the annotations; and it is said to be "particularly adapted for family use." What this means we do not profess to understand, but we hope no harm.

The Rev. W. W. Malet, under the somewhat vague title of "Church Extension," has published a plain and earnest inquiry into our ecclesiastical condition. We agree with him more often as to the remedies proposed, than as to the grounds on which he advocates them, or in the expectations which he builds upon them. As to the great questions of the justice of restoring the impropriated property of the Church, and of the sinfulness of party-spirit among the Clergy, there can be but one opinion; and we thank Mr. Malet for having so boldly broached them. His pamphlet is published by Hatchard.

"The Daughters of England, their Position in Society, Character, and Responsibilities," by Mrs. Ellis, author of the "Women of England," (London, Fisher,) amid a considerable portion of good sense, contains some flagrant violations of taste, and is tainted throughout with the leaven of dissent.

Barr's "Anglican Church Architecture, with some Remarks upon Ecclesiastical Furniture," (Parker, Oxford,) though containing little that is new, either as to letter-press or engravings, appears to us to give much useful information in a comprehensive way on that interesting study.

"Remarks on English Churches," &c. by J. H. Markland, Esq., F.R.S. &c. (Oxford, Parker, 1842,) make a most delightful book, which we cordially recommend, both for its tastes and its principles. The profits "will be given in aid of the funds for completing St. Stephen's Church, in the parish of Walcot, Bath."

We advise such of our readers as are smitten with the works of Neander to read a pamphlet by Dr. Wolff, which has just appeared, with the title of "Mystic Rationalism in Germany," (Hatchards, 1842,) and which consists of a very searching *exposé* of that author's "Life of Jesus Christ." We do not wish that people should either lose sight of the beautiful spirit which pervades so much of Neander's writing, or deprive themselves of the instruction which is to be found so abundantly therein; but it is right for them to know what he really believes and what he disbelieves.

"A Guide to the Holy Eucharist," (Cleaver, 1842,) has just been published by one of the ablest and most exemplary of the London Clergy. It is in two volumes, of which the first consists of meditations to be used at home, and the other is a companion for the service of the Church. We warmly recommend it as, along with the Eucharistica of Archdeacon S. Wilberforce, a valuable gain to our stock of devotional reading.

"Christian Unity," by Henry W. Wilberforce, M. A., (Burns, 1842,) is, as we fully expected, a most excellent tract, which cannot be too widely circulated.

We have also been pleased with some "Catechetical Examinations, &c." (Joscelyne, Braintree, 1842.)

"Charlie Burton," a tale, is a beautiful little tract, which was published last year by the Christian Knowledge Society. It is a shade too sentimental to our taste, but very excellent notwithstanding.

"Memoirs of the distinguished Naval Commanders whose Portraits are exhibited in the Royal Naval Gallery of Greenwich Hospital," (Greenwich, 1842,) will be found an excellent guide to that interesting collection, of which the father of the young gentleman from whose *private* press the book has issued was the founder. It is exceedingly well written, and may, we feel very sure, be depended on for its facts. We believe it is for sale at the hospital.

A weekly newspaper has just been started, with the title of the "Church and State Gazette," (Painter.) It has only reached one or two numbers as yet. The plan is very good, and if worthily carried out, will cause it to supply a desideratum.

We gladly announce a volume of sermons by the Bishop of New Jersey. (Rivingtons, 1842)

"The Principles that should influence a Christian Student," is the title given by Dr. Ollivant, senior tutor of St. David's, Lampeter, &c. to a very useful sermon preached in the chapel there.

The Cartoons of Raffaele have been published (Rivingtons, 1842) in a large form, and very cheap, so as to be well suited for schools. For wood-cuts they wonderfully convey the beauty of the originals. We have seen a large map sheet of animals, executed by the same artists (Messrs. Whimper) for the Christian Knowledge Society, which we greatly admire. The engravings now before us are accompanied by short letter-press descriptions.

"The Christian Month," by the Rev. W. Palin, M.A. (Ollivier, 1842,) consists of original hymns, with accompanying music, for each day of the month. The music is pretty enough, but not ecclesiastical.

---

## MISCELLANEOUS.

[The Editor is not responsible for the opinions expressed in this department.]

### A LETTER ON PROTESTANTISM, BY A PROTESTANT.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE "CHRISTIAN REMEMBRANCER."

MY DEAR SIR,—In common, I believe, with many whose opinion is of much greater consequence than mine, I have delightedly hailed Mr. Maurice's recent pamphlet in answer to Mr. Palmer. I do not, indeed, profess to see my way into every one of his conclusions; nor would he, I am sure, wish me to do so after a single reading of a book which travels over so much ground, and touches on so great a variety of points. I do not even profess to have arrived at a final judgment on the Jerusalem Bishopric, however little perplexity such arguments against it as Mr. Palmer's may occasion me: but in the name of all

that is healthy and loyal in England, do I thank him for the general tone and reasoning of his pamphlet;—for, as I conceive, vindicating the catholicism of the Church of England; for showing that our loyalty to that Church is compatible with loyalty to the Church universal; above all, do I thank him, for abiding by the term *Protestant*, as a rallying point of sound principles and most sacred feelings.

It is on this last subject, however, that I am now tempted to say a few words, because it is here that I discover a slight difference between him and myself. He seems to predicate Protestantism of every Christian community that resists the Pope's claim to be universal bishop; and on this principle holds the Greek to be Protestant Churches. Of course, in a case of this sort, all we have to do is to agree in our definitions; and if we find such an one for Protestantism as shall include the Greek Churches, they are included. But I contend that Mr. Palmer on this solitary point has an advantage over him, in that he uses the word *Protestant* in a sense nearer to that it has always borne, though I am still farther from accepting his definition of it. But I agree with him, that it does not come naturally to us to call the Greek Churches Protestant; that there are qualities usually denoted by the term which we do not perceive existing in them, and which we do find both in our own Church, in her daughters of Scotland and America, and in those Christian communities on the continent, with which we so far have a fellow feeling. I admit the quality to be a modern one in the Church, but I believe it to be a good one notwithstanding; one which, though not in itself sufficient, though no substitute for the higher quality of catholicism, a catholic Church may well rejoice to possess, and which having once possessed, such a Church is most essentially bound to retain and cherish.

Mr. Palmer has some perception of its existence and peculiarity in ourselves and abroad, but he seems to me to have no comprehension of its real character. His definition of it, as a setting up of the individual judgment against the dogmatic teaching of the Church, is one which I altogether refuse to accept. It is true, there have been some who have found such a description of it suit their ends, and accordingly have contended for it; but such have not been generally approved by their fellow-Protestants. The grand majority of plain people, to whom the word is a sacred one, and who are shocked and scandalized when they hear young men repudiating it, attach to it no such notion as this. Neither do I agree with those who condemn it as merely *negative*. With its original sense we have of course nothing do; nor do I think that, as generally used, it is confined to the notion of protesting against Popish corruptions. Even however if it were, it would not therefore be merely negative: terms are often both negative and positive,—negative, if used scientifically; positive, if used descriptively. Cold is in one point of view but the negation of heat; in another it is a word positive enough in all conscience. Strictly speaking, the word *Protestant* denotes, not what a man believes, but what he disbelieves; but it is forgotten that he may disbelieve and protest against what he disbelieves, because of something which he believes—that the negative in him may be the criterion of something very positive; and that when, in ordinary speech, we designate

him by the one, we spontaneously include in such designation the other also.

And thus it is that I think the word Protestant is most commonly used by us. People in employing it do not think of *protesting* at all; they are not thinking, or not exclusively, of certain Popish doctrines which they disbelieve. They take the term as denoting a certain temper, spirit, or quality, which resides in the Church to which they belong, which they believe ought to reside in it, and which I do not think they can find in the Greek Churches any more than in that of Rome. There are many things, undoubtedly, in which we resemble those Greek Christians, more than we do the foreign Protestant. Like them, we have retained the apostolical episcopate, and not allowed it to be tampered with by the notion of a bishop of bishops; like them, we retain and reverence the ancient traditions of the Church; like them, we have made the Church's liturgic development the one of most consequence. On the other hand, we are more than tinged with the Protestant hue; and in virtue of that one consideration, there is, as far as it goes, a fellow-feeling between us and unepiscopal Protestants, which we have not with Greeks, however irresponsible we may hold ourselves for the proceedings of the former, and however we may consider our tie with the latter as the stronger and more vital of the two.

I will endeavour to bring out my meaning a little more fully. I suppose every one will admit that there may, not only without offence, but with advantage, be a variety of schools in the Church:—schools, we call them, the apostolical term was “spirits.” Every one of these, as it arises, is to be tried and seen whether it be of God; and if approved, is to be received into the Church, there to find its proper place, and do its appointed work. A pious and learned writer of the present day\* seems to see indications of this variety of schools even in the sacred writings of the New Testament. In the early ages of the Church it is impossible not to discover several. No one, for example, would hesitate to speak of Chrysostom and Augustine as of different schools. Hardly ever do we expect to find them handling the same passage of Scripture in anything like the same way; and yet we do not consider this divergency as at all amounting to contrariety; we are accustomed to rejoice in it, to believe that the Church has been a gainer by possessing two such explorers of two such different yet fertile regions of thought. Similarly most men, of the least enlargement of mind, rejoice that the British Churches can boast both of a Taylor and a Leighton.

Now, if there may without offence be this variety, not contrariety, in schools of thought at the same time, why may there not be the same at different times? Indeed there must be, whether we like it or not; for each age of civilized history is in itself a school of thought, and none can be precisely the same with any other. And what I contend is, that it is a high, not a low, view of the calling and powers of the Church, to say that she has a capacity for receiving and entertaining every such school or *spirit* that is found to be of God,—that

\* Newman's Sermons, Vol. II. St. Philip and St. James.

in each successive age she is to draw into herself all that is fair, and pure, and lofty, and aspiring; that she is to harbour, and cherish, and develop, every class of religious thoughts that arises any where and at any time in the world; that to her men of whatever age, country, education, and temperament, are to bring, as to their only true home, the harvest of their struggles and their prayers. If this be so, it becomes no insignificant criterion of a Church's vitality, whether or not she be able to welcome and assimilate into herself such new spirits or schools of thought when God calls them into being. This criterion I find in the Primitive Church; for she was able to absorb and transubstantiate into herself whatever was divine among the men around her, whether the lingering hues of primeval truth in their religion, or the high aims of part of their philosophy, or the deep-based organization of their political existence. I do not think it by any means wanting in the Church of the Middle Ages; though with the progress of corruption, it was of necessity dying away. It was not wanting to the English Church at the Protestant epoch,—when, retaining by the merciful Providence of God her catholic constitution, she was enabled by the same gracious aid to receive into that constitution the new and needful spirit that had been so wonderfully awakened in Europe. And I trust it will not be wanting to her now, when a missionary and a catholic spirit is again called forth; when she is summoned to abandon the merely defensive attitude in which she was compelled to place herself by the events of the Reformation. I trust, that as at that period she could receive and welcome the spirit of Protestantism; so at this present, she may show herself able to meet the spirit of enlargement and union which is now beginning to make itself heard.

But this will not be, if we merely pamper ourselves with ecclesiastical antiquities, and turn away with disgust from every thing in the present time that is, at first sight, uncongenial to such tastes. It will not be, I am sure, if we get ashamed of our Protestantism; for never can we safely part with an advantage we have once gained. The events, indeed, through which the Church passes are fleeting, but the results in and on her are abiding, and never to be forgotten: Protestant it was needful that we should become, and Protestant we must cheerfully continue, would we be Catholic indeed.

But, to come to what is the real subject of this letter, (for who has said what I have hitherto been saying so well as the author who has called it forth?) what is this Protestantism for which I contend? It is here, as I have already said, that I differ from Mr. Maurice. He confines it to a protest against the notion of a visible centre to the Church. Doubtless, such a protest, if devout and earnest, and proceeding from a lively faith in the Unseen Centre, may involve in it all that is good and holy in Protestantism; and if the Eastern Christians be ever led to make it in this way, they may become like us in other things wherein they are not now. But I contend that merely to name this protest and its principle, does not describe what I mean by Protestantism. That word denotes to my ear, not, as I have already said, a rejection or neglect of the Church's dogmatic teaching, nor merely a denial of the Pope's necessary headship, though with one of

these things it has been often accidentally associated, and without the other it cannot exist; but a new and peculiar spirit, which arose in the west of Europe in the sixteenth century. New, on the whole, it must be confessed to have been, nor need we be afraid of the admission, if the principles be correct which we have already laid down. Only when an article of faith is propounded, only when the changeless creed is tampered with, need the Church turn away from novelty as such. But new as I confess the Protestant spirit to have been in its full development, prelude mutterings of it had been heard from of old: it is not too much, I think, to say that the Apostle of the Gentiles largely partook of it. I discern something of it in Augustine; while in Wiclif I find both its merits and defects in good measure. Not, however, till the need for it was at its height was it awakened into any degree of prevalence: then it arose, and made itself heard and felt over Europe; then, many causes, religious and secular, conspiring, was it received into the Church of England, and ever since it has dwelt in her. What is this spirit?

It is easier, perhaps, to feel than to explain what we mean by it; for it does not exercise itself so much in doctrinal statements, as in moulding the temper.\* It is something characteristic at once of Luther and Calvin, and of Barrow and Bull. Speaking generally, I think it consists in a greater prevalence of the reflective and disquisitive side of religion,—a greater occupation with questions relating to each individual's condition before God,—a greater reverence for the individual conscience, than were usual before; in a stern sense of the world's manhood, and consequent intolerance of all such dealing with the imagination of the people, as precludes conscious insight into the Christian scheme; an habitual assertion that the whole furniture of the Church is but means to lead the soul to God, and that the moment any part of it is rested in as an end, it becomes worthless and mischievous; a feeling that not here and there, but over the wide face of the Church has this been done,—that man has played the same part with the new as he had done with the old creation—made of it an instrument of apostasy; a grave caution, in consequence, in regard to ritual religion, which they who have once been made alive to this can never again lay aside; and an occupation most natural to men in such circumstances with the Pauline writings. If to these I add much reverence for the liberty of the individual, whose distinct existence is now so strongly asserted; for the integrity of the family, which the Church is not more than is necessary to tamper with; and for that of the nation, which must no longer acknowledge the jurisdiction of foreign ecclesiastics,—I shall have left but one element more to name

---

\* It is quite true, as Mr. Maurice observes, that Protestantism has given birth to much dogmatic theology. But this is but an accidental development, not a necessary accompaniment of what I mean by the Protestant spirit. There is a Protestant feeling, *e.g.* upon justification, which will turn away from the Tridentine decision that it is capable of increase, whether we hold the pure Lutheran theory, or the *Fides formata* of Bishop Bull. When I avow myself an adherent of the latter, an admirer of the *Harmonia Apostolica*, and of Mr. Newman's Lectures on Justification, I trust that my reverence for Protestantism, will be admitted not to have hindered my reverence for much besides.



in what appears to me to be Protestantism. This remaining element is a very important one:—it is a *sense of broken continuity* in the Church's history. I do not, of course, refer to continuity in essentials, for that were indeed fatal; neither would I deny that those who know that there is such a continuity in essentials, may well cherish an historical temper, and rejoice in a feeling of relationship to churchmen of every country and of every time; but I cannot shut my eyes to the fact, that whereas Greek and Latin Christians look up through an uninterrupted vista to their original, we find a great break in one place. The succession of the ministry indeed, and the faith of the creeds run on, which are the great things; but subordinate associations, rites, customs, and feelings of many sorts, experience a rude interruption in the sixteenth century. We are as men who have received a shock which we can in no wise forget. Do as we like, we cannot resemble the Roman Catholics and the Greeks here,—we cannot have that easy familiarity (so to speak) with the middle and the early ages, which results from the sense of an altogether undisturbed continuity. Do we envy them for this? It is natural for us to do so, for it has much the air of a privilege at first sight. But it is no privilege, nothing but a great calamity, if it proceed from a want of spirituality,—from the Church having got drowsy and never been well awakened again,—from a want of loyalty to God's cause and His truth. If it has happened that the Church herself was well nigh betraying the cause she was ordained to protect, if she was ceasing to witness for that spiritual life of which she was the appointed depository, if she was interposing herself between men and the Divine vision she was commissioned to reveal, then it is good, at nearly any price, to have a lively sense of this. It is good not to forget so new and vast a display of man's tendency to apostasy, good to remember how we have shown that there is in us that which can pervert the very divinest of Divine gifts, good to carry about with us the stern sobered spirit of those who know that they cannot make even a religious development without danger. I have thus attempted to sketch what I mean by the protestant spirit; and if I have failed in my sketch,—if I have not seized on the primary points,—still those who allege this may recognise the same thing as myself when they speak of that spirit, and may form the same estimate of it. Of course, I shall not be supposed to have been eulogizing all its manifestations. I have never meant to speak of it as sufficient by itself; and therefore I am nowise staggered, my faith in its being a spirit sent from God is in no degree shaken, at finding that its operations, without the bounds of apostolical order, have been unsatisfactory and perilous. Neither do I say, that its workings within those bounds have been at all times, and in every respect, such as might be wished. To say this, would be almost tantamount to saying that a particular church was perfect at a particular time. If we have ever cherished the Protestant spirit in any degree at the expense of the Catholic, we have assuredly gone wrong, and the results must in so far have been evil. I believe we have done this, and therefore I am not surprised that our ecclesiastical prospect presents us with so much that is unsightly, and so much more that is

perplexing; though I, for one, do not feel called to have an opinion upon every thing in the Church around me, and to measure, weigh, and pronounce on its whole present condition. I never expect, whilst on earth, to live in a state of affairs exactly such as I should have planned myself; and I am not apt to think it would be well, either for me or that state of affairs, were it possible that I should. We are strangely reluctant to own that the Church is under a guidance that we cannot comprehend.

One word more. I may be asked why I cannot content myself with the name *Reformed*, but must have this other of *Protestant* also. The former, I shall be told, exactly expresses the present position and state of the Church of England, and conveys no untoward impression of alliance with schismatical bodies abroad. I answer, that I am not content with the word *Reformed*, because it does not express what I have been trying to describe, because it is merely negative, because it merely tells me that the Church to which I belong made certain changes (as she trusted for the better) at a certain time, but does not convey the slightest hint as to the character of those changes. The word *Reformed* might be applied to the Church of Rome itself. I need not say that the Council of Trent, with all its faults, was in no slight degree a reforming one; that it swept away many an abuse, and that, ever since its assembling, the Churches which obey it have in many things been greatly improved. As to the name Protestant assimilating us, as far as it goes, to the Lutherans and others, I have already expressed my sense that such partial resemblance between us and them is a fact, and being such, I will not shut my eyes to it. Admitting it, commits me to nothing except the duty of candidly pondering it. I am not bound, by admitting it, to justify any departure from apostolical principles, nor to conceal my sense of any grievous deficiencies which I may find in Lutheranism. Seeing, then, that there is a spirit in our branch of the Church for which I must find a name if I wish to describe her present condition,—seeing that the word *Protestant* has long served for that name, seeing that whether it be etymologically fitted for that purpose or not, there is no other at hand,—I, for one, will continue to use it, and will trust to care and consistency to prevent my use of it being misunderstood. If I am right in what I have been laying down, there is no harm in my taking it as one of my religious designations, so long as I do not make it the sole or the chief one; no harm, so long as, on all proper occasions, I produce and glory in the higher name of Catholic, in my now subscribing myself,

Your obedient Servant,

A PROTESTANT.

February 15, 1842.

## ECCLESIASTICAL INTELLIGENCE.

## ORDINATIONS.

BP. OF CHESTER, at Chester, Feb. 20.

## DEACONS.

*Of Oxford.*—F. Hinde, B.A. Lincoln Coll.  
*Of Cambridge.*—H. G. Baily, B.A. Christ's;  
 J. Griffith, B.A. Christ's; H. Briant, B.A.  
 Queen's; H. J. Hindley, B.A. Queen's; D.  
 Shaboo, B.A. Queen's; M. I. Finch, B.A. Cath.  
 Hall; V. Lush, B.A. Corpus Christi; J. W. M'K.  
 Millman, B.A. St. John's; J. H. Sharples, B.A.  
 St. John's.

*Of Dublin.*—B. Mashiter, B.A.

## PRIESTS.

*Of Oxford.*—A. Boote, B.A. Brasenose; J.  
 Parry, B.A. Jesus; J. D. K. Scott, B.A. Balliol.  
*Of Cambridge.*—W. Bateson, B.A. Queen's;  
 R. Morewood, B.A. Queen's; E. Dean, B.A. St.  
 John's; G. Gibbon, B.A. Cath. Hall; J. Loah,  
 B.A. Jesus; R. P. Jones, B.A. Trin.; B. Cromp-  
 ton, B.A. Trin.; G. B. Norman, B.A. Trin.; E. F.  
 Manley, B.A. Christ's; R. Yerbough, B.A. Christ's;  
 W. J. Sherly, B.A. St. Peter's; A. Wallace, B.A.  
 Pembroke; F. Stewart, B.A. Pembroke; J. York,  
 B.A. Sid. Sussex.

*Of Dublin.*—H. F. Beasley, M.A.; W. T. Cust,  
 B.A.; D. Carson, B.A.; F. J. S. Hamilton, B.A.;  
 R. Parsons, B.A.; F. T. O'Donoghue, B.A.; R.  
 Townley, B.A.

*Of St. Bees.*—H. W. Ray.BP. OF LLANDAFF, in Church of St. Gregory,  
London, March 13.

## DEACON.

*Literate.*—T. Griffith.

## PRIEST.

*Of Cambridge.*—D. W. Williams, B.A. Trin.BP. OF LICHFIELD AND COVENTRY, at St.  
George's, Hanover-square, March 20.

## DEACONS.

*Of Oxford.*—W. Taylor, B.A. Trinity; G.  
 Bailey, B.A. New Inn Hall; T. C. Griffith, B.A.  
 Wadham.

*Of Cambridge.*—W. C. Mee, B.A. Christ's;  
 A. F. Boucher, B.A. St. Peter's; J. Thompson,  
 B.A. St. Peter's; J. Morris, B.A. Cath. Hall;  
 J. Fenwick, B.A. Corpus Christi; P. Brown,  
 B.A. Corpus Christi; S. Charles, B.A. Trin.;  
 W. E. Mousley, B.A. Trin.; A. Hibbit, B.A.  
 Cath. Hall; J. W. Hepworth, B.A. St. John's;  
 C. H. Hosken, B.A. Queen's; J. Spurgin, B.A.  
 Corpus Christi; J. Barr, M.D. Emmanuel; R.  
 Goldham, B.A. Corpus Christi; J. A. Beaumont,  
 B.A. Trin.; J. W. Bourke, B.A. Queen's.

*Of Dublin.*—F. S. Bradshaw, B.A. Trin.  
*Literate.*—J. Lewis, by letters dimissory from  
 the Bishop of Llandaff.

## PRIESTS.

*Of Oxford.*—W. S. Burd, B.A. Christ Church.  
*Of Cambridge.*—W. H. Pillans, B.A. Jesus;  
 R. C. Willey, B.A. Trin.; J. Lees, B.A. Corpus  
 Christi; J. Pulling, B.A. Corpus Christi; J. B.  
 Harrison, B.A. Magdalen.

Messrs. Hoskens, Macfarlane, and Chamber-  
 layne were also ordained on letters dimissory  
 from the Bishops of Exeter, Bath and Wells,  
 and Chester.

## ORDINATIONS APPOINTED.

BP. OF LONDON, May 22.

BP. OF LISCONS, May 22.

BP. OF HEREFORD, May 22.

BP. OF OXFORD, May 22.

BP. OF PETERSBURGH, May 22.

BP. OF ELY, June 5.

BP. OF WINCHESTER, June 10.

## PREFERMENTS.

Name.	Preferment.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.	Val.	Pop.
Ashby, E. Q.	Dunton, a.	Bucks	Lincoln	A. Smith, Esq.	*205	116
Brooking, A.	Bovingdon, P.C.	Herts	Lincoln	Hon. G. D. Ryder.		
Cerjat, H. S.	W. Horsley, a.	Surrey	Winch.	Rev. C. Weston	317	702
Courtenay, C. L.	Broadcliff, v.	Devon	Exeter		490	2085
Cresswell, J.	Compstall, P.C.	Cheshire	Chester	— Andrew, Esq.		
Dakeyne, J. O.	{ St. Benedict's, Lin- coln, P.C.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Rev. J. H. B. Mountain	90	654
Dean, E. B.	{ Lewknor, cum Ack- hampstead.	Oxford	Oxford	All Souls, Oxford	*320	709
Dene, A.	Rattery, v.	Devon	Exeter	Lady Carew	*215	506
Fidler, I.	Easington, a.	Oxford	Oxford	Bishop of Lincoln	80	13
Gilbert, E.	Hardingstone, v.	Northamp.	Peterboro'	Lord Chancellor	*534	1036
Gilbertson, L.	{ Langorwen, P.C. Obersythwith.	Cardigan	St. David's			
Hall, J. H.	Keyworth, a.	Notts	Lincoln	Rev. E. Thompson	*434	532
Heale, J.	Pointington, a.	Somerset	B. & W.	Lord W. de Broke	*247	165
Hughes, J.	Llandyfriog, v.	Cardigan	St. David's	Bp. of St. David's	*147	854
Jenkyns, J.	Wootton, v.	Beds	Ely	Lady Payne	*236	1051
Lloyd, H. W.	Pentre Voelas, P.C.	Denbigh	St. Asaph	C. Wynne	200	616
Lowe, F. P.	{ Saltfleetby, All Saints, a.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Magd. Coll. Oxford	*317	180

## PREFERMENTS,—continued.

Name.	Preferment.	County.	Diocese.	Patron.	Val. Pop.
Mansfield, G.....	{Trin. Church, F.C. Trowbridge.	Wilts	Sarum	Duke of Rutland.	
Marriott, F. A....	Cotesbach, n.	Leicester	Peterboro'		*106 108
Marshall, J. ....	{St. Mary-le-port. Bristol, n.	Gloucester	G. & B.	Duke of Buckingham	150
Mudge, W. ....	Pertenhall, n.	Bedford	Ely	Rev. J. K. Martyn....	*215 373
Roberts, R. ....	Milton Abbas, v.	Dorset	Sarum	Mrs. E. D. Damer.....	*127 846
Sainsbury, S. L.	{Beckington cum Standverwick.	Somerset	B. & W.	Own Pat. ....	*540 1340
Sandby, G. ....	Flixton, St. Mary, v.	Suffolk	Norfolk	Sir R. C. Adair.....	140 266
Smith, T. T. ....	Whaplode, v.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Chancellor	*369 1098
Sunderland, E....	Glenham, v.	Lincoln	Lincoln	D & C. of Lincoln	*90 869
Whitworth, T. ....	Addlethorp, n.	Lincoln	Lincoln	Lord Chancellor	*72 175
Williams, D. A....	St. David's, F.C.	Cardiff	Cardiff	Rev. D. Rowlands.	
Wordsworth, C....	Audley, v.	Stafford	Lichfield		*170 3617

\* \* The Asterisk denotes a Residence House.

## APPOINTMENTS.

Allin, T. M. ....	{Chap. to Langport Union, Somerset.	Murray, J. ....	{Ipswich Surrogate Marr. Li- censes.
Arnold, C. M. ...	Chap. to Marquis of Bath.	Milcolm, H. J. B.	Rur. Dean of St. Alban's.
Bennett, H. ....	Surrog. Pec. of Dn. of Sarum.	Nicholson, H. J. B.	{Rur. Dean Archdeaconry of St. Alban's.
Browne, J. F. ...	Surrog. Dioc. B. & W.	Parish, W. S. ....	Chap. to H.M.S. Agincourt.
Capel, S. R. ....	{Chap. to Wareham and Pur- beck Union.	Quartley, C. J. ...	Chap. to Bengal Presidency.
Carter, G. ....	Chap. to Visc. Canterbury.	Rogers, A. J. ....	Chap. to Madras Estab.
Hare, L. D. ....	Chap. to Aylesbury Union.	Turner, G. F. ...	Chap. to Duke of Cambridge.
Howell, A. J. ....	Chap. to Duke of Cleveland.	Wayle, —	Chap. to Giltspur-st. Compt.
Lacken, E. ....	Chap. to Lord Monson.	Wiberforce, {	Chap. to High Sheriff of
Lettle, J. ....	Chap. to Luton Union.	Archdn. R. J. ...	Yorkshire.
Lowther, B. ....	Chap. to Lord Lowther.	Windham, R. C.	Chap. to Sheriff of Norfolk.

## CLERGYMEN DECEASED.

Amphlett, R. H., Rec. of Hadsor, Worc. 60.	Garnett, J., of Trin. Coll. Cambridge.
Barker, J. C., Chap. to Bp. of Barbadoes, at Tortola.	Herdman, J., at Lesbury, near Alnwick.
Bathurst, C., Rec. of Seddington, Glouc.	Hildyard, W., Rec. Winestead, Yorksh. 80.
Braddon, J., Rec. of Merrington, 88.	James, T., Vic. of Llandeyfelly, Brecon, 73.
Blackall, S., Rec. of N. Cadbury, Devon, 71.	Jenkins, S., of Locking, Somerset, 76.
Bowman, T., Cur. St. Mary's, Gateshead, 84.	Johnson, A., Vic. of Lit. Baddow, Essex, 93.
Cantley, R., Rec. of Moulac, Bucks, 79.	Lowthian, J., Vic. of Thatcham, Berks, 83.
Clarke, J., Vic. of Ilkley, Yorkshire, 85.	Munden, J. M., Rec. of Corscombe, Dorset, 60.
Cowe, J., Rec. of Sunbury, 80.	Matthew, J., Rec. of Recpham, Norfolk.
Davenport, E. S., Rec. of Lydham, Salop.	Manhall, J., Per. Cur. of Ireby, Cumb., 92.
Elton, Rev. Sir E., at Clevedon, near Bris- tol, 87.	Moss, T., Ravenstonedale, 55.
Farrow, T., Per. Cur. Scampston and Knap- ton, Yorkshire, 78.	Prowde, R., Per. Cur. Hovingham, Yorksh.
	Robinson, J., Rec. Hochkifle, Beds, 74.
	Singleton, Dr., Archdn. of Northumb., 58.

## UNIVERSITIES.

## OXFORD.

MAGDALENE COLLEGE.—A Fellowship is vacant in this College, which will be filled up on the festival of St. James the Apostle next ensuing. Candidates are at liberty to call upon the President on any day before the 21st of July next, bringing with them a copy of their baptismal register, and a testimonial of good conduct from their College. They must be natives of Northamptonshire, and graduates of the University.

March 3.  
Degrees conferred.

M.A.

J. H. Mahony, Stud. of Ch. Ch. grand comp.;  
Rev. G. W. Brameld, Linc.; Rev. H. T. May,  
Fell. of New Coll.; L. G. Browne, Exet.; Rev.  
J. Murray, New Inn H. (incorporated from  
Trin. Coll., Dublin).

## B.A.

C. J. Smith, Ch. Ch.; E. H. Ballard, Wad.; W. Rogers, Ball.

The following have been elected Scholars of Univ. Coll.:—T. Arnold, from Rugby School, to the open Scholarship; and E. Armitage and J. Barmly, Comm. of Univ. Coll., to the Yorkshire Scholarships.

The Examiners of Candidates for the University Scholarship for the encouragement of Latin literature, have awarded it to Mr. Goldwin Smith, Commoner of Christ Church. Messrs. M. Arnold, of Ball., and G. Bradley, of Univ., honourably distinguished themselves in the examination. There were 28 candidates.

## March 9.

W. T. Hutchins, B.A., of Worc. Coll., unanimously elected Vinerian Scholar, vacant by the election of Mr. Reade, of Magdalene, to a Fellowship.

## March 10.

## Degrees conferred.

## B.A.

Sir J. E. Harington, Bart., and J. H. Pollen, Ch. Ch.; J. Soper, Magd. Hall; A. E. Wheldon, Trin.

T. Twiss, Esq., D.C.L., and Fell. of Univ., elected Prof. of Pol. Econ., in the room of H. Merivale, Esq.

Granted to the Rev. R. S. Stevens, Vicar of South Petherwin and Treven in Cornwall, an annual allowance of 50*l.* during his incumbency, towards the maintenance of an Assistant Curate.

W. B. T. Jones, Scholar of Trinity, elected Ireland Scholar for 1842.

**NEW PROFESSORSHIPS.**—Whereas her Majesty has graciously intimated her royal will and intention to found two new Theological Professorships in this University, and by an Act of Parliament passed in the session holden in the 3d and 4th years of her Majesty's reign it is provided that the said Professorships shall eventually be endowed with two Canonries of Christ Church; and whereas it is earnestly desired that Letters Patent should be obtained as soon as possible constituting the said Professorships, and enabling the University to make

regulations for the due government thereof, and that with a view thereto stipends should be provided *ad interim* for the two Professorships after their nomination by the Crown: it was agreed to grant to each of the said Professors the sum of 300*l.* per annum, as a stipend *ad interim*, to be paid to each of them by half-yearly payments from the time when he shall be appointed to his office, to the time when he shall succeed to the Canonry assigned to his Professorship by the above-mentioned Act of Parliament; the sum to be provided out of the moneys transferred in the year 1836 to the general purposes of the University from the funds of the University Press.

## March 16.

G. Smart, of Exet., and R. T. Davison, elected Lord Crewe's Exhibitioners; W. W. Bradley, of Linc., J. Banks, of St. M. Hall, and J. R. T. Eaton, of Elizabeth Coll., Guernsey, elected Scholars of Linc.; C. C. Crakehorpe, elected Dr. Hutchins's Scholar.

## March 19.

This being the last day of term, a congregation was holden, when the following degrees were conferred:—

## M.A.

Rev. G. T. Hyatt, of Wad.; Rev. G. Burder, of Magd. Hall; Rev. T. Lowe, of Oriel.

## B.A.

T. H. Mynors, of Wad.; S. Newington, of New Inn Hall.

B. C. Price, elected Scholar of Pemb.

The Vice-Chancellor has nominated the Rev. Frederic Charles Plumtre, D.D., Master of University College, to be one of the Pro-Vice-Chancellors for the remainder of the academic year, in the room of the Lord Bishop of Chichester.

Congregations will be holden for the purpose of granting Graces and conferring Degrees on the following days in Easter Term:—Wednesday, April 6; Thursday, April 21; Thursday, April 28; Friday, May 6; Saturday, May 14.

J. W. Knott, Commoner of Wadham College, elected Lushy Scholar.

## CAMBRIDGE.

## Feb. 14.

Elected Scholars of Magdalen Coll. in this University:—Neville, Sowden, Wigelsworth, Booker.

## Feb. 23.

The following graces passed the Senate:—1. To authorize a grant of 20*l.* from the University-chest to Mr. Galsheer, as a gratuity for extra services, rendered at the Observatory, in taking observations with the Northumberland telescope during the year 1841. 2. To appoint the Vice-Chancellor, the Master of Jesus Coll., Dr. Paget, Mr. Lodge, and Mr. Philpott, a Syndicate to consider and report to the Senate, on the steps to be taken for the preservation of the Paintings, Books, MSS., &c. in the Fitzwilliam Museum: the Perse Trustees having (in consequence of a decree in Chancery) given notice to the University to quit the premises in Free School-lane at Midsummer next.

NO. XVI.—N. S.

## Degrees conferred.

## B.D.

J. Stoney, St. Peter's.

## B.A.

G. A. Dimock, Sid. Sus.; W. A. Waring, John's; J. H. H. Hallett, Caius; J. H. Bastard, Trin.

## March 3.

J. Gibson, B.A., Scholar of Jesus, elected a foundation Fellow.

## March 7.

The Porteus Medals at Christ's Coll. were adjudged as follows:—*Latin Essay* to J. C. Reynolds; *English Essay* to Thos. Ramsbotham; *Reading Prize* to K. Swann.

B. H. Drury, B.A., elected Fell. of Govv. and Caius; C. F. Tarver, Schol. of King's, elected Fellow.

## March 9.

## CAIUS COLLEGE CLASSICAL EXAMINATION.

## Freshmen.

Ormerod, 1st prize.	Lewis.
Murphy, 2nd prize.	White, sen.
Collet.	Laborde } æq.
Hutt.	Travers }
White, jun.	Sandham.
Goodwin.	Carver.
Burrows.	Probyn.
Mann.	Ellice.
Dykes.	

## Second Year.

R. Barker, 1st prize	Westropp.
Martineau, 2nd prize.	T. Watson.
Brooke.	Suckling.
Trevlyan.	Raven.
Hopkins }	Henery }
Woodhouse } æq.	Hill }
Baumgartner,	T. Watson } æq.
Chorley.	Evans.
W. G. Watson.	Hilton.
Robertson.	Dove.
Bromhead.	Kendell.
Loftus.	

## March. 12.

Elected Bell's Scholars:—Holden, Trin.; Perowne, C. Ch.

## Degrees conferred.

## B.D.

Rev. R. W. Evans, Fell. of Trin.; Rev. C. Lenny, John's.

## B.C.L.

L. Morison, Trin.; T. G. Stawell, Caius.

An election of a scholar will be held on Friday, the 22d of April next, for C. Ch. Coll.; open to natives of Lancashire, Hampshire, Surrey, Lincolnshire, Gloucestershire, Wiltshire, Kent, Bedfordshire, Oxfordshire, and the dioceses of Bath and Wells, Exeter and Durham.

## CLASSICAL TRIPOS, MAR. 12, 1842.

## Examiners.

W. H. Bateson, M.A., St. John's.  
E. H. Bunbury, M.A., Trinity.  
E. Warter, M.A., Magdalene.  
J. Hildyard, M.A., Christ's.

## CLASS I.

Denman, Hon. G. Trin.	Shaw, B. Trin.
Munro, H. W. J. Trin.	Morse, F. St. John.
Atkinson, E. Clare.	Wilson, W. G. St. John.
Peter, R. G. Jeaus.	Kingsley, C. Magd.
Wolfe, A. St. John.	

## CLASS II.

Nugée, G. Trin.	Carter, S. R. Emman.
Ainger, G. H. St. John.	Montague, E. W. Caius.
Ommanneny, G. D. W. Trin.	Woodford, J. R. Pemb.
Burstow, T. I. Trin.	Vidal, J. H. St. John.
Venables, E. Pemb.	Parr, W. Cath.
Vaughan, E. H. Christ's	Sheepshanks, T. Trin.
Vidal, O. E. St. John.	Sheringham, J. W. St. John.
Fowell, R. D. St. John.	

## CLASS III.

Walpole, R. Caius.	Thrupp, C. J. Trin.
Yeoman, T. L. Trin.	Light, W. E. St. John.
Slade, J. St. John.	Hogg, L. Emman. } æq.
Conybeare, J. C. Peter.	Ramsay, A. Trin. }
Riley, J. Trinity.	

The two gold medals, value 15 guineas each, given by the Chancellor to commencing Bachelor of Arts, who, having obtained Senior Optimes at least, show themselves the greatest proficient in classical learning, have been adjudged to H. A. J. Munro, B.A. and B. Shaw, B.A., Trinity. J. P. Birkett, Esq., B.A., Mathem. Master at Harrow, elected Lay Fell. of Jes. Coll., in place of Mr. Merry.

## March 14.

The following were elected Found. Fellows of St. John's Coll.—H. Bailey, B.A.; B. Williams, B.A.; J. Atlay, B.A.; J. Bather, B.A. E. Atkinson, B.A., Schol. Clare Hall, elected Fellow.

## PROCEEDINGS OF SOCIETIES.

## INCORPORATED SOCIETY FOR PROMOTING THE ENLARGEMENT, BUILDING, AND REPAIRING OF CHURCHES AND CHAPELS.

A meeting of the Committee of this Society was held at their chambers, St. Martin's-place, on Monday, the 21st of March, 1842; His Grace the Archbishop of York in the chair.

Among the members present were the Bishops of London, Durham, Bangor, Carlisle, Chester, Ely, Salisbury, and Hereford; Sir T. D. Acland, Bart. M.P.; the Revds. Dr. Spry, Dr. D'Oyly, H. H. Norris, and Benj. Harrison; N. Connop, jun., I. S. Salt, Benj. Harrison, James Cocks, and Wm. Cotton, Esqrs.

Grants were voted towards building a chapel in the parish of Holy Trinity, Hull; rebuilding the church at Salcombe, in the parish of Marlborough, Devon; rebuilding the chapel at Fir-

bank, in the parish of Kirkby Lonsdale, Westmoreland; enlarging by rebuilding the church at Barford, Warwickshire; new roofing St. George's church at Manchester; building a new transept to, and erecting a gallery in the church at Ainsworth, Lancashire; extending the north side of the church at Wheatenhurst, Gloucestershire; restoring the body of the church at Aldringham, Suffolk; enlarging the church at Steeple Claydon, Buckinghamshire; repewing the church at Llanbadarnfynydd, Radnorshire; enlarging gallery in the chapel at Sankey, in the parish of Prescott, Lancashire; enlarging by rebuilding the church of St. Lawrence at Southampton; building a church at Nailsea, near Bristol, and other business was transacted.



## DIOCESAN INTELLIGENCE.

LONDON.—*Additional Colonial Bishoprics.*—The following is a Pastoral Letter addressed by the Lord Bishop, expressing his wish that a collection should be made in the churches of the diocese, in aid of the Colonial Bishops' Fund, on Palm Sunday.

"*London House, Feb. 7, 1842.*

"REV. SIR,—You are no doubt aware, that a declaration was agreed to by the Archbishops and Bishops of the United Church of England and Ireland, at a meeting held at Lambeth, on the Tuesday in Whitsun week, 1841, setting forth the insufficiency of the provision made for the spiritual care of the members of our Church, in the distant dependencies of the empire, and the great importance of erecting additional bishoprics in the colonies. A copy of the declaration is sent herewith, to which I request your most serious attention.

"I am persuaded that the accomplishment of the object, which we have in view, may be ensured, under the blessing of God, if the Clergy will exert themselves to collect contributions in their respective parishes; and I am desirous of suggesting, to those of my own diocese, the propriety of commencing that exertion on the first day of the approaching holy week, in which we commemorate the death and passion of our blessed Lord, and offer up our special prayers for all estates of men in his holy Church, and for the gathering together in one fold, under one Shepherd, of all those who are not yet within its enclosure.

"It is my wish, that you should have a collection made in your church, in aid of the Colonial Bishops' Fund, on Palm Sunday next, and I would suggest that it might be made in the following manner:

"After the sermon, in which I trust you will explain the object for which the offerings of your people are solicited, let the offertory sentences be read from the communion table, not omitting those which instruct them that are taught in the word to minister unto them that teach in all good things. Whilst these sentences are reading, let the churchwardens, or other persons appointed for that purpose, collect the offerings of the people, and bring them to the minister, to be by him humbly presented and placed upon the holy table. Let him then proceed with the prayer for the Church militant, and with the remainder

of the service, according to the Rubric. This revival of the ancient practice of our Church has been attempted in several parishes with great success; but although I would gladly see it become general, I do not wish to interfere with your discretion in the present instance, if you should have good reason for preferring some other mode of making the collection.

"I conclude in the words of the declaration, and 'under a deep sense of the sacredness and importance of this great work, and in the hope that Almighty God may graciously dispose the hearts of his servants to a corresponding measure of liberality, I earnestly commend it to the good will, the assistance, and the prayers of all the members of our Church.'

"I am, Rev. Sir,

"Your faithful friend & brother in Christ,  
"C. J. LONDON."

Collections were accordingly made in obedience to his Lordship's letter. Up to this time, the sum of 4,500*l.* has been received from 300 churches; and it is hoped that the whole amount will not be less than 7,000*l.*

Her Majesty the Queen Dowager has sent 300*l.* (in addition to a former donation of 100*l.*) to the treasurer of the Bethnal-green Churches Committee, in aid of the funds for completing the work of supplying ten additional churches, schools, and parsonage-houses, in that parish.

*South Hackney Church-Fund.*—The following is the result of the third annual collection, made in the parish church of South Hackney, at the offertory, on the first Sunday after the Epiphany, 1842:—

To the Society for Promoting	£	s.	d.
Christian Knowledge	..	37	0 0
To the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel in Foreign Parts	..	55	2 0
To the National School Soc.	56	2	0
To the Church-Building Soc.	46	11	6
To the Additional Curates Society	..	43	5 0
To the Society for the Propagation of the Gospel, as a special contribution in obedience to the Queen's letter	..	33	17 6

£271 18 0

"As respects the CHURCH FUND generally, the Committee are anxious to direct particular attention to several interesting features in its plan, convinced that their exhibition will insure to it the continued and cheerful cooperation of every sincere and intelligent member of the Church of England.

"The first feature they would point out is, its setting forth the claims of five Church Societies simultaneously. It is important to do this, not only because no one Society can detach itself from the others, and accomplish its own object by itself; but because it is both proper and expedient to make known at the same time the different wants of the Church, and to set before her members the means by which they may supply them. For it is evident that a number of annual subscriptions, be they large or be they small, if they are *duly apportioned*, are made to minister at once to the edification and the extension of the Church. By the union of single offerings houses of prayer are erected, ministers in poor parishes provided, schools established, Bibles, Prayer-books, and useful tracts dispersed; and not only are the christian principles of individuals strengthened and confirmed, but the condition of various classes of christian brethren, both at home and abroad, is improved, and the Gospel itself propagated in heathen lands. And all this it will be seen is done through the medium of the Church, of which each Christian is led to regard himself a living and responsible member. By the same means, too, the unity, extent, and consistency of the Church's design is made apparent, and greater success may be anticipated to her exertions, than if desultory efforts be made for any one of her objects, or for all of them at different and irregular periods.

"A second feature of the plan is, that it recommends itself to the notice of individual members of families, and with great propriety, through the medium of their respective heads. And this, it will be admitted, is a legitimate way of promoting christian feeling and sympathy in the Church. 'If one member suffer, all the members should suffer with it; and if one member be honoured, all the members should rejoice with it.' Children too, taught at the firesides of their parents, or in the nurseries of christian education, and servants encouraged in the houses of their masters to think of and minister, by little sacrifices, to the necessities of others, will, it may be

hoped, gradually imbibe the benevolent spirit of the Church's prayers, and be more careful in after life than they perhaps otherwise would be, to exemplify her principles and her prayers in *practice*. It may be hoped, too, that as the centres of other circles in different spheres of society, they will exert a becoming and beneficial influence upon all around them—an influence which shall expand and penetrate to a degree beyond the range of human calculation.

"A third feature of the plan is, that it solicits support from all, whether rich or poor, *in proportion to their ability*. The tendency of this feature is to educe charitable actions from christian motives, and to awaken in the christian mind an abiding sense of its responsibility. It is quite unnecessary to dwell upon the consequences of attending to, or neglecting the working out, this scriptural principle: they are obvious to every sensitive and devout Churchman.

"Another interesting and important feature of the plan is, that it emanates from the parochial Clergy, under the sanction of the Bishop of the diocese. The tendency of this feature is, to keep up a due sense of the pastoral relation, and to aid the development, and promote the recognition of, true Church principles. It serves to remind ministers and people of their mutual obligations, and not only of the duties they owe to each other, but to the whole Church, and the wide world. And it tends withal to promote *Church union*, the benefits and blessings involved in which it is utterly impossible to overrate.

"A fifth, and the most important feature, inasmuch as it forms the groundwork of the plan, is, that it is 'framed in strict accordance with the principles of our ecclesiastical polity,' the Societies it embraces being all, in principle and in practice, whether operating at home or abroad, 'under the efficient superintendence of the Bishops of the Church.' It is this circumstance which gives the great Church Societies so strong and peculiar a claim to the affectionate regards of every member of the Church."

[It is much to be wished that other parishes would follow the good example here set.]

---

SALISBURY.—*The Bishop of Salisbury and the Bible Society.*—The Lord Bishop of Salisbury has addressed the following letter to the Rev. A. Brandram, in ex-

planation of the motives of his resigning his connexion with the Bible Society:—

"To the Rev. A. Brandram.

"MY DEAR SIR,—My attention has been directed to a letter addressed to the editor of the *Record*, and signed by yourself and Mr. Browne, as joint secretaries of the British and Foreign Society, in which you correct an erroneous statement respecting the grounds of my retirement from that Society, which originally appeared in the *Dorset County Chronicle*, and was transferred from that paper to the *Record*. It is hardly necessary for me to say that your statement is quite correct, and that the paragraph in question was altogether erroneous.\*

"The mistaken impression, however, on this subject, which has gone abroad, seems to make it necessary for me to remove a misapprehension which may exist, by stating the reasons which did induce me to take a step, in many respects so disagreeable to me, as that of resigning my connexion with the Bible Society.

"In the letter in which I conveyed to you my resignation on the 20th of August in last year, I said, 'I am so unwilling to speak unfavourably of an institution to which I have for some years belonged, and which comprises amongst its supporters so many persons whose opinions have every claim to my respect, that I forbear to state more fully the reasons that have led me to the conclusion that it is my duty to abstain in future from taking part, as I have hitherto done, in the operations of the Society.'

"In accordance with the feeling here expressed, it was my wish to withdraw myself with as little publicity as possible; and not, unless obliged to do so, to state my reasons for taking this step. And even now, though, in order to justify my own course, I am obliged to point out what appear to me the great objections inherent in the constitution and practice of this Society, it is my desire to do full justice to those persons, many of them men whose opinions I am bound highly to respect, who either do not see these defects in the same light in which they appear to me, or think that the advantages attending the operations of the Society in other respects are so great as to outweigh these objections.

"The following, however, are the considerations which were mainly in-

strumental in leading my mind to the conclusion at which I have arrived:—

"1. The constitution and character of the public meetings by which the business of the Society is carried on. 2. The manner in which its operations frequently interfere with the good order of the Church, and obstruct the ministry of the parochial Clergy. 3. The tendency of the Society to obscure the office of the Church in relation to the word of God.

"I will, as briefly as I can, explain what I mean on each of these points.

"Whoever has been in the habit of attending the meetings of the Bible Society is aware that they are composed of persons belonging to every variety of religious denomination, and holding every shade of opinion which is compatible with the acceptance of the holy Scriptures as a revelation from God. All these persons meet together, and, from the nature of the occasion which assembles them, with an appearance of recognised equality in a matter touching upon the foundation of religious belief. The Independent, the Baptist, the Quaker, the Socinian, assemble on the platform by the side of the member of the Church, on a common understanding that their differences are *pro hac vice* to be laid aside, and their point of agreement in receiving the Bible as the word of God, and being zealous for its distribution, is to be alone considered. Do not let me be misunderstood as implying that a dishonourable compromise of opinion on the part of any one is required by the constitution of the Society. On the contrary, I know that 'union without compromise' is a sort of watchword in it. But what I do say is, that the necessary tendency of a meeting so composed is to magnify the point of agreement between its members, and to sink, as of comparative insignificance, their respective differences. Whoever has been in the habit of attending meetings of the Bible Society must be familiar with such expressions as that the members of the Society are only separated by 'unimportant differences,' and are joined in 'essential unity;' whereas an examination of what these 'unimportant differences' are, will show that, in one quarter or another, they comprise most of the chief doctrines, and all the ordinances of the Christian religion; and

\* The statement was to the effect, that the Bishop had relinquished his connexion with the Society because it would not put itself under the Archbishop of Canterbury.

are so clearly recognised in the constitution of the Society, as to make it impossible for a meeting of persons assembled to promote the distribution of God's word, to unite in worshipping him in prayer.

"I have felt, therefore, that the practical tendency of such meetings is to foster a spirit of indifference to the most vital doctrinal truth, as well as yet more clearly to exhibit a disregard of the distinctive character of the Church, as the body to which that truth is entrusted. A member of the Church at such meetings is always liable to hear statements made on those topics which must either be replied to at the risk of very inopportune discussion, or apparently be sanctioned by being passed over in silence.

"The second point on which I proposed to remark is the manner in which the operations of the Society frequently interfere with the good order of the Church, by being obtruded into the parishes of Clergy who do not feel at liberty to take a part in them. A very great proportion of the Clergy are not members of the Bible Society; but from the constitution of that body its operations are necessarily carried on without reference to this, and meetings are holden in the parishes of such Clergy contrary to their wishes.

"It not unfrequently happens, in such a case, that a Clergyman finds that a meeting of the Bible Society is to take place in his parish. The dissenting chapel is perhaps the place of assembly. Of his own parishioners the chief supporters of the cause are the leading dissenters. But members of the Church from other parishes who are supporters of the Society also attend. Perhaps some neighbouring Clergy are induced, even under such circumstances, to take part in the proceedings, which thus practically assume the appearance of giving a sanction and support to the system of dissent; tend to lower the influence of the Clergyman with his parishioners; and to make the very distribution of the Scriptures a means of upholding those 'erroneous and strange doctrines to God's word,' which every Clergyman is

bound by his ordination vow, 'with all faithful diligence to banish and drive away.' I have had repeated and painful experience of such cases in the course of the last five years; and I have felt that, while I continue a member of the Society, the sanction of my authority was indirectly given to proceedings which I could not but regard as very detrimental to the good order of the Church, and the influence of the Clergy in their respective parishes. Reflection upon these two great practical evils in the working of the Society will, I think, show that they both proceed from the same fundamental error, that, viz. of forgetting that a body so constituted is not properly capable of performing functions which essentially appertain to the Church in her character of 'witness and keeper of holy writ,' and are capable of being satisfactorily discharged by her alone.

"I mean satisfactorily discharged on the principles which a member of the Church is bound to recognise; because the indifference to positive doctrine, and the unlimited license of private judgment, both in points of faith and discipline, which it is the effect of the system of the Society to foster, are as much at variance with the spirit of the Church as they are agreeable to the views of some of the bodies that are separated from her. And this is the third ground which I mentioned as having influenced my judgment in coming to the decision I have done.

"I have now stated the reasons which brought me to the conclusion that the British and Foreign Bible Society is not so constituted as to enable it to discharge in the best and most satisfactory manner the great office it has undertaken; and that, sensible as I am of the importance of the object proposed, and anxious to promote it, I cannot properly cooperate with this Society in doing so, or continue a member of it, consistently with my duty in other respects.

"I have the honour to remain,

"My dear Sir,

"Your very faithful servant,

"E. SARUM.

"Wilton Crescent, March 2, 1842."

#### WALES.

CARMARTHEN.—The Lord Bishop of St. David's lately preached an admirable sermon in the Welsh language to a crowded congregation, in St. David's

Church, in this town, from James i. 22, "Byddwch wneuthurwyr y gair, ac nid gwrandawwyr yn unig, gan eich twyllu elch hunain." His Lordship took a

luminous view of his subject; his style was pure and idiomatic, and his enunciation clear and distinct. It would require close attention to be able to say he was not a native, so perfectly has he mastered the difficulty of pronouncing one of the most difficult of European

languages. His Lordship, we believe, is the first Bishop that has preached in the Welsh language since the days of "Rysiat Davies, Esgob Ty Ddewi," the author of the celebrated pastoral letter to the Cymry, more than two centuries ago.—*Ch. Intell.*

#### SCOTLAND.

EDINBURGH. — *Confirmation.* — This rite was performed on Thursday in St. Paul's Chapel, York-place, by the Right Rev. Bishop Terrot, D.D., to an unusually numerous assemblage of young persons of both sexes; not the least interesting part of the ceremony arose from the circumstance, that about 100 soldiers belonging to the 53d regiment,

now in the Castle, attended at the same time with the other candidates, and were confirmed by the Bishop.—*Edin. Paper.*

The Rev. James Marshall, late Presbyterian minister of the Tolbooth Church, Edinburgh, has been presented to the Rectory of St. Mary-le-port, Bristol, vacant by the decease of the Rev. James Neale.

#### FOREIGN.

##### ARRIVAL OF THE BISHOP OF THE UNITED CHURCH OF ENGLAND AND IRELAND IN PALESTINE.

(From a Correspondent of *The Times*.)

Jan. 27.

THE entry of Bishop Alexander into the city of David was marked by as favourable circumstances as could possibly have been anticipated. On the morning of the 20th instant, our little community was much excited by the arrival of a messenger from Jaffa, with the intelligence that the British Consul-General and Bishop Alexander had arrived off that port in a steam frigate, and might be expected in Jerusalem on the following day. Mr. Nicolayson, a highly respectable and talented Holstein Danish gentleman, who is now a Clergyman of the Church of England, and the head of the mission for promoting Christianity among the Jews at Jerusalem, immediately started to meet them. The rencontre took place at Ramleh, the Ramah of Scripture, (still a considerable town,) where the Bishop, the Consul-General, and a numerous suite, halted to pass the night. The Bishop took up his quarters at the house of the American Consul, the wealthiest Christian in the place; and the Consul-General, with several officers of the Devastation steam frigate, alighted at the Armenian convent. On the following day they made their entry into our ancient capital, in a procession which will be remembered by those who saw it to the latest day of their lives. When

within five miles of the gates they were joined by the few British and American residents on horseback, headed by Mr. Proconsul Johns, who is architect of the intended church, as well as *locum tenens* of Mr. Young. On approaching the town, the cavalcade, which already consisted of fifty or sixty persons, was swollen by the junction of the Bey, second in command of the troops, who, accompanied by a guard of honour, and the janissaries of the Pasha, had been sent to compliment Colonel Rose on his arrival, while all the loungers of Jerusalem turned out for the occasion. Mrs. Alexander, and the younger portion of her family, were conveyed in a large oriental litter over the rocky and precipitous tracts which lead from Jaffa to Jerusalem. The procession, which consisted of more than one hundred persons on horseback, passed on, and the scene which ensued at the Bethlehem-gate, by which it entered the town, baffles all description: on the one side were the grey massive battlements and picturesque towers of Jerusalem, no mean specimen of the solidity with which Sultan Suleyman fortified the conquests of his predecessor Selim; and on the other, was the vale that leads to Bethlehem, now rugged and now undulated, with all its light and shade softened in the approaching twilight;

while the dark and singularly even and unpeaked line of the mountains of Moab beyond the Dead Sea walled in the prospect. The wildly-accountred and unearthly-looking Bedouin irregulars, who had been playing the djereed, and gamboling round the procession at the full speed of their desert horses, contented themselves with firing off their muskets, being now hemmed in by the motley throng of citizens and fellaheen,—Mussulmans in their furred pelisses and well-folded turbans, down to the filthy old Polish Jew in the last stage of wilful hydrophobia. After acknowledging the presentation of arms at the Bethlehem-gate, the party moved on towards the house of Mr. Nicolayson, and just as the new-comers turned their heads to admire the Titan-like masonry of the tower of Hippicus, which dates from the days of Herod the Tetrarch, the guns thundered forth the salute for the eve of the Courban Bairam. Thus, by an odd chance, the Protestant Bishop made his public entry into one of the four holy cities of Islam (the others are Mecca, Medina, and Damascus) on the occasion of one of the greatest festivals of the Mahomedan religion. Colonel Rose descended at the Spanish convent of Terra Santa. Dr. Alexander took up his quarters temporarily with Mr. Nicolayson, his own residence, which is upon the Pool of Hezekiah, being as yet unfurnished. On the 22d Colonel Rose, Dr. Alexander, and a large party, inspected the intended site of the new church. It will be built upon the most elevated part of the city; the body of the church will be Gothic, and the towers in the style of mosque minarets, which accords admirably both with the church itself and with the other public edifices of the city; for Gothic and Saracenic are the twin daughters of the

Byzantine style. The Bishop's residence will be Elizabethan. The stone necessary for the edifices will be procured from the Mount of Olives. In the afternoon of the same day Colonel Rose presented Dr. Alexander to Tahir Pasha, who, as I have understood, received him with great politeness. Of course, it would be an illusion to suppose that this reception proceeded from any sympathy with the objects of the mission on the part of the Turkish authorities. On the 23d the Bishop preached his introductory sermon, choosing for his text Isaiah, chap. lxxv. and ver. 15: "Whereas thou (alluding to Jerusalem and the Jews) hast been forsaken and hated, so that no man went through thee, I will make thee an eternal excellency, a joy of many generations." The tendency of the Right Rev. Prelate's discourse was to show, that although Jerusalem had endured, and might still endure, much suffering in the fulfilment of inspired prophecy, nevertheless brighter days were at hand.

*The Completing of the Cathedral of Cologne.*—The great energy which has been displayed for several years past in Prussia, to complete that most gorgeous specimen of mediæval German architecture, has now received a new impetus by the formation of an auxiliary committee in Bavaria. It is said, that the idea of having this great edifice completed by the cooperation of all German nations emanated from the king himself, who has increased his annual donation of 10,000 thalers for the completion to 50,000 thalers, about 200,000*l.* "It is said," says the *Dusseldorff Gazette*, "that the king of Prussia will not lay the first stone for the new works of the cathedral till next autumn."

#### CHURCHES CONSECRATED OR OPENED.

Kingston-on-Thames.....	St. Peter's.....	Bishop of Winchester.....	Feb. 19.
St. Mary's, Spital Square, London, } (formerly Sir J. Wheeler's Chapel) }		Bishop of London .....	Feb. 24.

#### TO CORRESPONDENTS.

We have to thank a Correspondent (whose letter is not at this moment at hand) for his remarks on the subject of the Sonnet, and also for the very pleasing Poems under that title, with which he has accompanied them. They do not, as he is well aware, quite answer our notion of the Sonnet, but still we think them very beautiful. If our correspondent will re-consider our articles, he will find that we do not advocate unnecessary trammels, but such rules as seem essential as an outward form for the Sonnet, if its peculiar scope and purpose are to be indicated by its structure.

We have sent the letter from St. David's, Lampeter, to the author of the notice, to which it is a reply.